



Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-124
Wednesday
30 June 1993

Daily Report Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-124

CONTENTS

30 June 1993

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Reaction to, Criticism of U.S. Bombing of Iraq	1
America 'No Less Dangerous Than Iraq' [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jun]	1
Commentator Wonders Who Will Be Next [FEDERATSIYA 29 Jun]	1
Russian Support 'Understandable' [Radio Rossii]	2
Adamishin on Lack of Time To React [Moscow Radio]	2
Council of Republic Condemns Bombing [ITAR-TASS]	2
Soviet of Nationalities Condemns Bombing [Moscow Radio]	3
Commentary on Reason for Bombing [Moscow International]	3
Russia 'Too Hasty' in Support [IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]	4
'Recurrence of Gunboat Diplomacy' Feared [ROSSIYA 30 Jun-6 Jul]	4
Gorbachev: Strike 'Unacceptable and Dangerous' [AFP]	5
Criticisms 'Becoming Louder' [Moscow International]	5
Paper Says U.S. Favors Non-Resumption of Nuclear Tests [ITAR-TASS]	6
Pozner Discusses Clinton's Low Ratings [Moscow TV]	6
PRAVDA Presents Arguments Against START II [23 Jun]	8
U.S. Ambassador Visits Nizhny Novgorod [ITAR-TASS]	10
Yeltsin on First Official Visit to Greece	10
Visit Previewed [IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]	10
Relations Examined [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]	11
Notes Topics of Interest During Visit [ITAR-TASS]	11
Greek Prime Minister Assesses Visit [ITAR-TASS]	12
Yeltsin Meets President Karamanlis [ITAR-TASS]	12
Takes Part in Official Ceremonies [ITAR-TASS]	12
Friendship, Cooperation Treaty Signed [ITAR-TASS]	13
Kiev's Stance on U.S. Strike Against Iraq Viewed [IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]	13
Chernomyrdin's Ukraine Visit Resolves Some Economic Issues [ITAR-TASS]	13
Leadership Seen Toughening Stance on Estonia [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]	14
Estonian Law Aimed at 'Deportation' [ITAR-TASS]	14
Yaztrzhembskiy on Russians' Rights [ITAR-TASS]	15
Document Sent to UN [Moscow Radio]	15
Government May Halt Gas Supplies to Belarus [ITAR-TASS]	15
Armenian Delegation Signs Agreements in Moscow [Yerevan Radio]	15
Colonel on NATO Targeting Western Border [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jun]	16
Churkin Discusses Solutions for Bosnian Crisis [Belgrade TV]	17
Khasbulatov Meets With BBC Chairman [Russian TV]	20
Kozyrev Meets EC Ambassadors in Moscow [ITAR-TASS]	20
Eureka Membership Promises 'Real Economic Benefits' [IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]	20
West Said Not Providing 'Promised' Aid [PRAVDA 30 Jun]	21
Russia Notifies DPRK of Nuclear Waste Sites [ITAR-TASS]	21
IZVESTIYA Analyzes ICAO Finding on KAL Tragedy [25 Jun]	22
Yaztrzhembskiy Defends Arms Deal With India [ITAR-TASS]	26
'Compromise' Urged on Deal [IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]	26
Possible Reshuffle in Foreign Ministry Viewed [MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS 25 Jun]	27

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Constitution Issues

Next Conference Session Set for 12 Jul [ITAR-TASS]	28
Yeltsin Team Seen To Make 'Tactical Error' [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	28

Oblasts, Krays Vie for Status With Republics	[KOMMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Jun]	29
More on Regional Officials' Conference	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]	29
Official Accuses Yeltsin of 'Blackmail'	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]	30
Ambartsumov Welcomes 'Constructive' Conference Work	[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 26 Jun]	30
Conference Harmony Said 'Propaganda Myth'	[PRAVDA 29 Jun]	30
Progress Toward Composite Constitution Viewed	[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 29 Jun]	32
'Momentum' of Constitutional Process Maintained	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]	33

Political Issues

Yeltsin Appoints Two Officers to Security Council	[ITAR-TASS]	34
Yeltsin Names Anti-Crime Directorate Head	[Moscow TV]	34
Poltorakin: Khasbulatov 'Stage-Managed' Property Issue	[ITAR-TASS]	34
Yerin: Supreme Soviet Wrong Forum for Makarov Charges	[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 29 Jun]	35
Court Urged To Investigate Leadership Crimes	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]	35
Cabinet Members' Activities Reported	[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 29 Jun]	36
Coup Plotters To Sue for Loss of Reputation	[Moscow TV]	36
Rutskoy Views Domestic, Foreign Issues	[Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET 26 Jun]	36
Radio, TV To Go Off Air If No Funding	[Radio Rossii]	38
Russian TV Curtails Broadcasts	[Russian TV]	38
Further on Radio Broadcast Cuts	[Radio Rossii]	38

Economic Issues

Fedorov Cautiously Optimistic for Economy	[ITAR-TASS]	39
Zaveryukha Reports to Parliament on Food Imports	[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 29 Jun]	39
Chernomyrdin on Support of Rural Areas	[Radio Rossii]	40
Cited on Agricultural Credits	[Radio Rossii]	40
Agriculture Minister Expects 'Pretty Good' Harvest	[ITAR-TASS]	40
Central Bank Interest Rate Policy Applauded	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]	41
Internal Affairs Aide Links Privatization, Crime Surge	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]	41
Ministry Seen Moving Toward State Planning	[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	41
Jan-May Economic Figures Quoted	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 25 Jun]	42
Official Economic Statistics Questioned	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 25 Jun]	43

Military Issues

Arms Exports Statistics for Jan-May 1993 Reported	[SEGODNYA 29 Jun]	44
New Allegations Link Grachev to Mercedes	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]	44
Further on Defense Enterprise Conversion Conference	[ITAR-TASS]	45

Supreme Soviet

Khasbulatov Postpones Trip Due to 'Heavy Work Schedule'	[ITAR-TASS]	45
Proceedings From 30 Jun Session Reported		46
To Discuss Draft Budget	[ITAR-TASS]	46
Government Submits Updated Budget	[Moscow Radio]	46
To Discuss Top Officials' Tax Returns	[ITAR-TASS]	46
Shaposhnikov Denies Corruption Charges	[Moscow Radio]	46
Shaposhnikov Appointment Put to Vote	[Moscow TV]	47
Appointment Postponed	[ITAR-TASS]	47
Further on Shaposhnikov Debate	[Moscow Radio]	48
Government Urged To Raise Inflation Estimates	[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 26 Jun]	48
Further on Draft Budget	[SEGODNYA 29 Jun]	49
Khasbulatov Opens Defense Conversion Conference	[Moscow Radio]	49
Says Conversion 'Chaotic'	[ITAR-TASS]	49
Officials Interviewed	[Russian TV]	50
Hearings on 'Dead' Radio, TV Law Draft Viewed	[Radio Rossii]	51
Stepanakov: Immunity Status Should Be Changed	[ITAR-TASS]	52
Defense, Security Body Not To Bow to Pressure	[Russian TV]	52
Deputies Criticize Army Reform Leader, Leave in Protest	[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 25 Jun]	52

'Army Reform' Deputies Resign	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 25 Jun]	52
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----

Regional Affairs

New Ossetian Administrators Appointed	[ITAR-TASS]	53
Khanty-Mansiysk Leader on Economic Issues	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 24 Jun]	53
Tatarstan President Comments on Economy	[Moscow TV]	54
Kuban Cossack Leader Assails Local Authorities	[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]	55
Melnikov Named Yeltsin Representative in Chita Oblast	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]	55
Defense Ministry Group Leaves for North Caucasian MD	[ITAR-TASS]	56
Peacekeeping Efforts in North Caucasus Summarized	[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]	56
Tyumen Oil Industry Problems Reported	[Moscow TV]	56
Magadan Oblast To Sell Gold at London Exchange	[SEGODNYA 29 Jun]	57

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Zlenko Criticizes U.S. Attack on Iraq	[Kiev International]	58
Official Says Attack Not 'Appropriate'	[Kiev International]	59
Cabinet Denies Report of Nuclear Arms Agreement With Russia	[Kiev International]	59
Crimean Leader Opposes Black Sea Fleet Division	[HOLOS UKRAYINY 23 Jun]	59
Sevastopol Graduates Go to Russian, Ukrainian Navies	[HOLOS UKRAYINY 23 Jun]	60
Kravchuk, Slovak President Sign Treaty	[Kiev International]	60
French Consortium To Aid in Chernobyl Project	[UNIAR]	60

National Affairs

START Working Group Holds Discussions	[UKRINFORM]	60
Parliamentary Deputy Chairman Hrynyov Resigns	[ITAR-TASS]	60
Supreme Council Accepts Resignation	[Kiev International]	61
Situation at Zaporozhye Nuclear Plant Viewed	[ITAR-TASS]	61
Pervomaysk, Krasnodon Continue Strikes, Add Demands	[Kiev International]	61
Import Duties Lifted on Some Commodities	[UKRINFORM]	61
Communist Forces Unite, Seek To Restore Soviet Power	[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]	61
Communist Party Leaders Condemn Kravchuk	[PRAVDA 25 Jun]	62
Union of Crimean Communists Sets Up Party	[PRAVDA 26 Jun]	63

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Shushkevich To Meet With Clinton 23 Jul	[Minsk Radio]	64
Polish Leader Addresses Supreme Soviet	[Minsk Radio]	64
Holds News Conference	[Warsaw Radio]	64
Says Poland Has 'No Territorial Claims' on Belarus	[ITAR-TASS]	64

Moldova

Russia To Grant 'Few Billion Rubles' to Dniester	[BASAPRESS]	65
Romanian Embassy Opens in Chisinau	[BASAPRESS]	65

CENTRAL ASIA

Tajikistan

Opposition Casualties Result From Border Clashes	[ITAR-TASS]	66
Parliament Appeals to Afghanistan on Border Issue	[ITAR-TASS]	66
Dushanbe Cracks Down on Opposition Parties	[SEGODNYA 29 Jun]	66
Supreme Soviet Appoints New Justice Minister	[Dushanbe Radio]	66

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

National Assembly Confirms Guseynov Prime Minister [ITAR-TASS]	67
Aliyev Says Appointment Averts 'Civil War' [ITAR-TASS]	67
Aliyev, Guseynov Hold Joint News Conference [TURAN]	67
Further on News Conference [ITAR-TASS]	68
Aliyev Proposes, Parliament Passes Cabinet Changes [ASSA-IRADA]	68
Aliyev Replaces Leading Officials [Baku Radio]	68
National Assembly Discusses Elchibey's Fate [TURAN]	69
People's Front To Cease Activities Until Elchibey Returns [TURAN]	69
PFA Headquarters Communications Cut Off [TURAN]	69
Elchibey Supporters Hold Rally in Baku 29 Jun [ITAR-TASS]	69
Guseynov Comments on Recent Events, Prospects [ITAR-TASS]	69
Guseynov's Troops Moving Toward Nagorno-Karabakh [Moscow International]	70
Former Security Chief Freed for Health Reasons [ASSA-IRADA]	70
Official Denies Foreign Oil Activity Suspended [ASSA-IRADA]	70
Aliyev Assures Turkey on Oil Agreements [Baku Radio]	70
Signing Oil Contract With Western Firms Postponed [Moscow Radio]	71
Aliyev Issues Decree To Raise Minimum Wage [Radio Rossii]	71

Georgia

Chikvaidze Demands Earliest Russian Troop Withdrawal [CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]	71
Abkhaz Minister Urges Treaty With Russia To Defeat Ardzinba [ITAR-TASS]	71
Comments on Sukhumi Bombing [Tbilisi Radio]	71
Parliament Discusses International Ties, Abkhazia [Tbilisi Radio]	72

BALTIC STATES

Lithuania

U.S. Actions Against Iraq Viewed as 'Self-Defense' [Vilnius Radio]	73
Russia Halts Natural Gas Supplies [Vilnius Radio]	73
General Says Klaipeda Troop Withdrawal Going 'Smoothly' [Vilnius Radio]	73
RESPUBLIKA on Foreign Policy 'Mistakes' [15 Jun]	73

Reaction to, Criticism of U.S. Bombing of Iraq

America 'No Less Dangerous Than Iraq'

PM2906120193 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 1

[Aleksandr Vasilyev report: "Unease in Baghdad Again: Civilian Casualties as Result of American Missile Strike"]

[Text] The confrontation between the United States and Iraq is becoming dangerous for the world. Iraq is dangerous because, if the Americans are to be believed, it prepared an attempt on the life of former U.S. President Bush during his visit to Kuwait in April. To imagine this plot accomplished and its potential international consequences makes your flesh creep.

However, America, in this instance, is no less dangerous than Iraq. On what grounds did the White House deliver its verdict whereby 23 Tomahawk missiles were launched on Baghdad? Three missiles deviated from their planned course and, according to the latest information, killed eight civilians, among them a well-known Iraqi actress—a Tomahawk hit her house.

The investigations carried out by American and Kuwaiti detectives into the circumstances of the putative attempt on the life of George Bush are clearly inadequate to justify such a step. Iraq remains a member of the international community and its representative still sits in the United Nations. Let's assume that Baghdad is in violation of international legislation—although this still has to be proven—but any actions against the country must be lawful. And this presupposes the collection of evidence (done) and the holding of an international trial, conferences, and so forth (not done). The UN Security Council held a sitting after the attack on Baghdad, and the United States did not receive unanimous support there. It is said that Washington consulted with its NATO allies and Russia. But discussing such matters by telephone is not a serious way of doing business. The United States cites Article 51 of the UN Charter "on the right to self-defense." It is worth recalling that the Soviet Union sought to justify its invasion of Afghanistan by the same article. They have undoubtedly forgotten about this in the Russian Foreign Ministry, which hastened to support the U.S. "act of retaliation."

The Tomahawk strike was carried out against Iraqi intelligence headquarters. It is presumed that that is where the attempt on Bush's life was planned. American correspondents bombarded Pentagon representatives with question: Why was it not carried against Saddam Husayn himself? The Pentagon response is that Husayn could not be reached, while the intelligence building could easily be hit. Here the words uttered by Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, during an interview with CNN appear very cynical: Missiles veer off course quite often, we regret the civilian casualties—war is war, allegedly.

Pretty smart people are sitting in Washington, people who know that they should not destroy the Iraqi leader and that any attack on Saddam Husayn merely enhances his authority among the masses. The point is that they need Husayn alive. The White House needs an enemy—a bloodthirsty, loathsome enemy despised by the "civilized community."

It is noteworthy that the raid on Baghdad was mounted at a time when Bill Clinton's popularity has fallen to the lowest rating of any American president since World War II. Clinton has gotten himself well and truly tangled in knots in the Balkans. The American public does not like people who are indecisive and incompetent. Iraq offers a wonderful opportunity to show resoluteness. In accordance with old American tradition, the White House incumbent is trying to make up in the international arena for failures back home.

This is dangerous: Washington, let's be clear, is in constant need of an enemy. But if we imagine that a Tomahawk had accidentally hit Saddam Husayn the United States would then need to find a new villain of international dimensions.

Commentator Wonders Who Will Be Next

MK2906111693 Moscow FEDERATSIYA in Russian
No. 71, 29 Jun 93 (Signed to Press 28 Jun 93) p 1

[Yuriy Viktorov commentary: "Clinton on the War-path"]

[Text] Baghdad's residential areas have become targets for U.S. cruise missiles. Multistory buildings have been destroyed. Six [as published] people died in the attack, dozens wounded. The funeral of the missile strike's victims turned into a mass anti-American rally.

Of course, one can presume that the liberal, saxophone-playing Bill Clinton does not feel any animosity toward the Iraqis, but even if this is true, one should not forget that the current chief of the White House is not much of a paramount chief in the American political kitchen. After the collapse of the second great power and the self-dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, there is virtually no one left to contain the American military machine. And it is known that a gun hanging on the stage is bound to fire from time to time.

As a matter of fact, Bill Clinton himself also needs some firing practice, and badly so. His approval rating is dropping steadily. Even the first hundred days of his presidency went largely unnoticed, although celebrating this is a must in the U.S. But what should actually be noticed? Care for homosexuals in military uniforms? Other deeds somehow escape memory. The press keeps counting how many times the president cried in public and quarreled with his wife in private. Two of the three largest television companies did not think it necessary to air his keynote speech on the economy.

Can there be anything worse? So, it is high time to pose as a tough guy. He is itching to take on Serbia, but this is too risky an affair even if it is limited to air strikes. The allies and his own troops deployed in Europe are too close by. A good counterstrike may follow. In Somalia, something is going wrong. What remains is a time-tested move: a shelling of Iraq.

They did not even try to think up a more or less plausible pretext this time. Or their resourcefulness may have failed them, but in any event, a reference to an alleged assassination attempt against a private person, which George Bush actually has been since January, that was allegedly being prepared by the Iraqi secret services in April (!) could not be called other than ludicrous had it not been connected with so tragic events. If this logic is to be applied, Washington should have been bombed at least a dozen times. The facts of CIA-planned assassination attempts against Fidel Castro, Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi, and, again, Saddam Husayn, and other leaders who do not suit the United States are common knowledge.

Nonetheless, the U.S. allies and satellites were quick to express their admiration for their patron's actions. UK Prime Minister John Major "entirely approved" of the action by the Americans, whose missiles brought death to the innocent residents of the Iraqi capital. The Russian Foreign Ministry has issued a statement calling the U.S. action "justified." None of the Arab countries, however, except Kuwait, supported, at least directly, the U.S. punitive action.

Those who think such actions justified can henceforth hardly condemn, say, the Abkhazian Armed Forces for bombing raids on Sukhumi, for the Abkhazians are shooting on their own territory, and not on some alien land; the Abkhazian people are defending themselves on their own soil, and not far away from it.

And the last point. After the reprisals against the civilian population of the Somali capital, the American military machine, clearly building its muscles, delivered a strike at another capital—this time that of Iraq. What target will it choose next time?

Russian Support 'Understandable'

LD2906125193 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Station commentary—read by Sergey Shevykin]

[Text] The U.S. missile strike against the Iraqi capital of Baghdad remains the main topic of international commentaries. Some observers have drawn attention to the timing of this controversial action. The leaders of the seven leading states in the world will meet in Tokyo in a few days. It cannot be ruled out that President Bill Clinton, taking part in this type of event for the first time, wanted to arrive in Tokyo on a white charger. One aim of the demonstrative show of force against Baghdad

was clearly to confirm that, for the United States, there are no problems in the world that cannot be solved by some means or other.

Russia, which was notified of the missile strike beforehand, voiced understanding—in the person of Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev—of the Clinton administration's action. And this is understandable, if we bear in mind that Boris Yeltsin is also invited to Tokyo, where one of the main issues will be the discussion of financial assistance to our country.

Adamishin on Lack of Time To React

LD2906162093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] The Russian Foreign Ministry did not have an opportunity to react to the U.S. action regarding Iraq in good time, as the Americans notified us about their intentions only an hour before they delivered a strike against Baghdad. This was stated today by First Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin at a joint sitting of the Supreme Soviet chambers. The situation that has formed following the missile attack on the headquarters of the Iraqi intelligence service during the night of 26-27 June was discussed. Adamishin believes that the reasons for the strike lie in the crisis situation in the Persian Gulf being unsettled.

Council of Republic Condemns Bombing

LD2906163893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1628 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow June 29 ITAR-TASS—A statement of the Russian Supreme Soviet to condemn U.S. bombing of the Iraqi capital was adopted today at a joint meeting of the Russian Parliament chambers by the Council of the Republic.

The second chamber, the Council of Nationalities, did not have the quorum and the voting on the issue was postponed till Wednesday.

A parliament statement, whose draft was submitted by the Russian Unity opposition bloc, says bombing of Baghdad facilities on June 27, 1993, "runs counter to principles of the international law and revives the cult of force in international relations". The Russian Parliament "launches a protest against acts of international violence taken by the United States and stresses the need to solve the most difficult problems with civilized political methods".

The statement was heatedly debated as First Deputy Russian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin explained to the Parliament reasons for the Russian leadership's support to this act of the United States.

He connected the stand of the Russian Foreign Ministry with the unsettled Kuwaiti crisis. "The U.S. President assassination attempt is not the only one in a row of current Iraqi actions," he stressed.

Adamishin recalled Iraq does not recognize juridical existence of Kuwait, and "it has not taken the path of honest fulfillment of U.N. resolutions approved by the international community". In his words, Iraq "continues to conceal some mass destruction weapons, including components of biological and chemical programs, as well as some missile components".

"Terrorism cannot be left unpunished," stressed the first deputy Russian foreign minister and noted in this connection the Russian Foreign Ministry voiced an opinion "actions of the Americans are justified". "However, this goes only to the specific case and does not mean we will further justify these or those actions of the United States or other countries".

Adamishin expressed the hope the U.S. and Iraq in their bilateral conflict will "find mutually acceptable solutions and Russia will contribute to this". He stressed Russia wants Iraq to "stop being an outcast and return to the international community as a fully-fledged member and a stabilizing factor in its region".

The official said the U.S. blow, which ruined the building of the Iraqi intelligence, also killed Iraqi civilians. In this connection the Russian side has presented its condolences to families of the dead. He stressed "none of the Russian citizens currently in Baghdad suffered".

Soviet of Nationalities Condemns Bombing

LD3006084093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0800 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] The statement by the Supreme Soviet condemning the U.S. bombardment of the capital of Iraq was upheld by the Soviet of Nationalities today. Yesterday, members of the Soviet of the Republic voted for it. The parliament statement—the draft of which was submitted by the Russian Unity opposition bloc—notes that the bombardment of the sites in Baghdad on 27 June 1993 contravenes the principles of international law, reviving the cult of force in international relations. Nevertheless, a number of deputies spoke against the majority position. Gleb Yakunin believes the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet is seeking a pretext to support Saddam Husayn, while Sergey Nosovets voiced the view that the more effective the Russian Foreign Ministry policy is, the fiercer the opposition becomes.

Commentary on Reason for Bombing

LD2906174293 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1500 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Commentary by Ilya Grekov: "Why did Layla al-'Attar Have To Die?"]

[Text] Had the current administration in the White House been as much of a supporter of human rights as it has been urging others to be, it would have sent a special plane to Baghdad with two messages. The first one should have included guarantees for a pension for life for

the family of the famous artist Layla al-'Attar, killed during the recent ugly raid, as well as for other families of victims. The second message should have expressed regrets to the Iraqi people for the pains caused by such an ordeal. Such a thing is not going to happen, of course, because they did not strike Baghdad with missiles in order to apologize afterward. The aim of the attack was, undoubtedly, quite different, although it is not clear.

Naturally, we have all heard Washington's official story, and many people in the world have accepted it. It is always like that when someone who is rich and serious begins talking about things which are ambiguous, and few people would bother to disagree with such a respected person. However, the polls in America itself have shown that the majority of the citizens there did not agree with the strike against Baghdad, believing that the U.S. authorities went ahead with it in order to increase their prestige inside the country, something which has yet to take place.

The prestige of the Iraqi authorities inside Iraq has clearly increased. The difficulties of daily life facing the Iraqis as well as the political problems in the north and the south of the country have taken second place in view of the foreign threat. An Iraqi paper reported today the call of a senior official of the Iraqi Information Ministry who urged Iraq and the other revolutionary Arab forces to organize legitimate self-defense and launch attacks against Americans, Zionists, and Kuwaiti and Saudi traitors.

Tens of thousands of Iraqis took part in marches in Baghdad on Sunday to commemorate the victims of the American strike; they were shouting: "O Saddam, we demand revenge." There is every indication that they meant what they were saying.

It is necessary to find a solution to the current crisis. It has become very clear how the UN position has become ridiculous with U.S. help. The demands which Iraq has been asked to meet are quite extensive. The problem remains of how to secure their implementation. The lack of serious acts against Iraq would play, in propaganda terms, into the hands of the Iraqi leadership. Serious acts, like the ugly American strike, would play further into the hands of the Iraqi leadership.

What do the United States and the rest of the big powers want to achieve? Do they want to consolidate further the position of President Saddam Husayn, a position which has already been strengthened enough? It is not clear whether this was their aim or not. The situation is so ridiculous that we might be able to see in the very near future a change in UN policies towards Baghdad. This, however, is not important. What is more important is the answer to the following question: Which American official can explain under what rights the United States killed the artist Layla al-'Attar?

Russia 'Too Hasty' in Support

PM2906184?793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jun 93 p 3

[Stanislav Kondrashov article: "The Blurred Effect of Instruction By Means of Missiles"]

[Text] Bill Clinton's nighttime missile attack on Baghdad has aroused a stormy response in the world not just because it marked the young U.S. President's debut in the use of armed force as an instrument of diplomacy and of a specifically American form of instruction, it also raised the age-old question: Does the end justify the means? Or are there means which actually compromise the end, even the most justified one?

Opinions vary, and not only among Saddam Husayn's supporters (precious few though they are) but also among his opponents. We would like to know why they differed among those who heartily detest the Iraqi dictator but who reacted critically to the act of missile shock therapy as a means which was misused and which did not achieve its political aim. On the one hand, critics argue, you really don't need to pander to international terrorists and bandits. On the other hand, the difference between the civilized world and the scoundrels with their jungle morality is that every punishment must be legally and morally validated.

Take the time chosen for the attack. By taking place at night it meant that the staffers of the Iraqi intelligence service, the target of the attack, were safe but, conversely, condemned those who were sleeping peacefully in their homes, unaware that three of the 23 U.S. Tomahawks would stray from the target and hit them.

If you take the chosen time in a broader sense, in the interests of legal validation it would surely have been better to wait for the sentence of the Kuwaiti court on the 14 Iraqis and three Kuwaitis who stand accused of attempting to assassinate former President George Bush on 13 April 1993 when he was paying a visit to Kuwait.

The surprise factor, which does not play a great role in a missile attack against an incomparably weaker opponent, proved to be a major propaganda failure. Clinton should have informed not only Bush, but Husayn and his fellow countrymen, and the rest of the world as well so as to increase the "instructive" effect of the inevitability of punishment. What stopped Clinton from chivalrously declaring his intentions first so as to create a further favorable contrast with the plotters and their supreme leader? Evidence presented in advance and tried out on the American public, at the United Nations, and in the capitals of the allies and other states is more convincing and better than evidence presented after the event.

These are glaring tactical blunders. They detract from the reference to Article 51 of the UN Charter on the right to individual and collective self-defense, which seems far fetched anyway.

Nevertheless, Washington's Western allies, as well as Russian diplomacy, have quite clearly supported Bill Clinton. There are several reasons for that. First, the law (to some extent a stereotype) of solidarity of the participants in the anti-Saddam coalition requires automatic approval of the very principle of retribution while closing one's eyes to the "details" of the execution. Second, the exaggerated delicacy toward a still inexperienced U.S. President: His popularity at home has fallen sharply and he is clearly becoming nervous under the hail of criticisms that he has let go the reins of foreign policy and is not ensuring America's due world leadership in the radically altered conditions of international life. To counter those criticisms he resorted to the American language of grand gestures—with the help of missiles.

Third, we, of course, would really like to know the position of the Russian leadership. The latter, in my view, was too hasty and unconditional in its support for Washington's action, which completely overshadowed the timid reservations about the need to avoid an escalation of the violence. The not unfounded view is being expressed that this position is a political gesture to Clinton in exchange for the expected support on the eve of the "big seven" meeting in Tokyo. That, after the cancellation of Chernomyrdin's visit to Washington, it is tactically disadvantageous for Russia to display a sudden difference of opinion with the United States. Perhaps there is some reason to this. Ultimately politics is about trading. But those who know how to maintain a silence instead of immediately agreeing and approving are the ones who get the best deal...

Colin Powell, America's top general, has acknowledged that there was a certain "collateral damage" from the missile attack on Baghdad—meaning casualties among the civilian population. It seems to me that the "collateral damage" was somewhat broader and did not just affect the Clinton administration. It should not be ignored—if we are to learn the lessons for the future.

'Recurrence of Gunboat Diplomacy' Feared

MK3006095093 Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No.27,
30 Jun-6 Jul 93 p 1 (Signed to Press 29 Jun)

[Vladimir Kedrov report under the "Let's Think Together" rubric: "The Middle East Vendetta"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] What ends have the Americans pursued? I think the strike on Baghdad was a follow-up to their traditional policy vis-a-vis uncomfortable "third world" regimes and also a continuation of "Desert Storm." For it should be recalled that many were wondering then why the allied troops did not bring the campaign to its logical conclusion—the deposition of the Iraqi dictator. It was not difficult militarily, but impossible politically—a chaos with absolutely unpredictable consequences could have reigned in the region, because a downfall of the Baghdad regime would have triggered a series of coups and local wars inside the

country. Moreover, the United States would have become an even greater enemy in the eyes of all Arab and Muslim peoples. This situation has continued until the present day—Saddam Husayn is, undoubtedly, uncomfortable for the United States and he will go on trying to take revenge on the Americans for the offenses he suffered, but destroying him is absolutely impossible. At least, for the time being.

Even putting aside the moral aspect of the U.S. Administration's latest move it cannot be called a success. It revives the tactic of strikes and counterstrikes which characterized relations between the United States and Libya throughout the eighties, but which was unfolding against an entirely different balance of forces both in the region and in the world. At present, this tactic grows even more dangerous given the Arab world's overelectricified state and its constantly surging tide of Muslim extremism. In this situation, such actions may lead to its actual "Balkanization" or "Caucasization" with elements of blood feud attached; there have been reports that terrorist acts against U.S. citizens were planned to be carried out in the United States itself. Furthermore, the Americans are intruding in areas they have insufficiently studied and of which they understand little.

It is hard to predict how events will unfold. It is clear, however, that neither Saddam nor the U.S. leaders plan to retreat. The United States' main allies, including, as a matter of fact, Russia, have supported the action by the U.S. military, although in the United States itself it drew mixed responses. I am certain that the air strike boosted the authority of "the Arab nation's knight" both inside Iraq and among his sympathizers in the world.

So, are we in for "a recurrence of gunboat diplomacy" that we had repeatedly denounced in the past, to be followed by an inevitable "explosion of popular indignation in the region?"

Gorbachev: Strike 'Unacceptable and Dangerous'

*AU3006110893 Paris AFP in English 1051 GMT
30 Jun 93*

[Text] Rome, June 30 (AFP)—Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has accused the United States of using tactics reminiscent of the Cold War, describing the U.S. cruise missile attack on Iraq as "unacceptable and dangerous."

In an editorial published in the Italian daily LA STAMPA Wednesday [30 June], Gorbachev said the U.S. attack on Baghdad early Sunday [27 June] showed that Washington "opted to ignore the prerogatives of the U.N.," and "merely gave the allies a few hours' warning, in a style reminiscent of the Cold War."

Gorbachev said the U.S. action "took us back several decades, to the time when the United States acted as an international policeman."

"The United States does not have the right to assume all the roles—acting as examining magistrate, prosecutor, tribunal and executioner," Gorbachev said.

The attack was a response to "an alleged assassination attempt which never took place," Gorbachev said, and Washington had "plenty of time to put the matter before the U.N. Security Council to get a collective, legitimate decision."

He also said the Russian leadership showed a "servile and myopic desire to please Washington" by expressing "unconditional and hasty support" for the U.S. attack.

Criticisms 'Becoming Louder'

*LD3006131393 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1110 GMT 30 Jun 93*

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton—read by announcer]

[Text] An American fighter bomber patrolling the no-fly zone in southern Iraq yesterday fired a rocket at an Iraqi anti-aircraft radar launcher. The incident would have hardly aroused concern, if it hadn't been linked with the United States missile strike on Iraq's intelligence headquarters in Baghdad, killing a number of civilians.

Countries bordering Iraq, and not only they, have reason to fear that tension in the Persian Gulf zone may go up, the more so that Washington does not rule out a second strike on Iraq if it takes revenge. The United States has already sent the Theodore Roosevelt aircraft carrier, escorted by ships, towards the Iraqi coast.

Meanwhile, statements condemning the strike are becoming louder, despite the fact that it was qualified as self defense, aimed at curbing international terrorism. Questions arise: could a military action be morally justified if civilians were killed? Isn't Article 51 of the United Nations charter giving a state the right to individual or collective self defence only in case of aggression against it, being too broadly interpreted? And finally, could the United States strike on other countries? At one time the United States aircraft bombed and fired missiles on the Libyan capital Tripoli.

The NEW TIMES newspaper writes the next target after Baghdad could be Tehran, on which Washington is keeping a dossier of terrorist acts.

All these questions call for precise and clear answers, in the first place from the United Nations Security Council. Washington didn't even preliminarily consult about the strike.

Russia's Foreign Ministry officially announced it regarded the United States military action as justified, but there are also different opinions. For one, the Russian parliament, the same as the Ukrainian parliament, sharply condemned the attack. Its statement says such actions contradict international norms and revive the position from strength policy in international relations.

Addressing parliament, Deputy Russian Foreign Ministry Anatoliy Adamishin explained that the justification of this particular incident didn't mean that Moscow would excuse similar actions by the United States or any other country in the future. He expressed hope that Washington and Baghdad would find a mutually acceptable solution to the conflict.

Russia, from the very beginning, doesn't want Iraq to be an outcast. It wants Iraq to return to the world community on equal terms, as a stabilizing factor in the region, said Anatoliy Adamishin, Russia's deputy foreign minister.

Paper Says U.S. Favors Non-Resumption of Nuclear Tests

LD3006090693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0757 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolyov]

[Text] Washington June 30 TASS—The Bill Clinton administration, having made a political U-turn, now tends towards a decision not to be the first to resume nuclear tests, the BALTIMORE SUN newspaper reported referring to U.S. officials.

Although the U.S. President has not yet announced his final decision, officials and independent experts believe that a shift of emphasis has taken place during the current debate inside the administration and the "no first test" option looks increasingly preferable now.

Only several weeks ago the administration was prepared to make a step in the opposite direction and announce a limited programme of nine tests: six were to be carried out by the United States and another three by Britain which uses the U.S. nuclear test site in Nevada, the newspaper pointed out.

However, shortly after such a plan came to light, the administration saw for itself that the plan had little backing in congress. Arms control advocates also stated that new nuclear tests would undercut U.S. efforts towards the resumption of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty in 1995.

Although the Pentagon and the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff still favour a resumption of nuclear tests on the plea of the need to ensure the safety and reliability of nuclear arsenals, the department of energy gave up its firm support for the nine-test programme, officials said.

Pozner Discusses Clinton's Low Ratings

OW3006015793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel and Orbita Networks in Russian 1845 GMT 21 Jun 93

[Studio interview with Vladimir Pozner by Petr Orlov and Irina Zaytseva; from the "Utro" program—live]

[Text] [Orlov] It is not very often that we talk about international politics, about top issues, since we have more than enough of our own problems. However, this time it concerns us not only because it is linked directly with Russian affairs, but because in my opinion, we can make a lot of interesting analogies. So, we will be talking about Bill Clinton and the extraordinary situation in which he finds himself just four months after the elections he won so convincingly.

Our studio guest is—no, not Bill Clinton, but—Vladimir Pozner, who has just returned after working nine months in the United States, where he observed all this and discussed it with Phil Donahue, no doubt, and possibly not only with him. He can tell us about the situation in the United States today in this regard, especially since our prime minister is planning to go there with a full agenda for talks.

So, what happened to Bill Clinton? Why has his popularity dropped so low?

[Zaytseva] It has fallen to 28 percent.

[Pozner] Presently, about 32 percent support him. Such a low level of support for a president is unprecedented in history. It has never been so low since this rating has been recorded. So, in this regard, it is a unique situation. Why this occurred...

[Zaytseva, interrupting] What was the reason for this?

[Pozner] It happened simply because people stopped believing him, because it turned out that he was not a man of his word...

[Zaytseva, interrupting] He managed to do so little in this time.

[Pozner, continuing] ...and not a man of decisions. Let us begin with the election campaign. Everything was fine. Then at some point, a woman by the name of Jenifer Flowers was said to be his lover. She enthusiastically confirmed this. There was a big scandal. Double standards are the norm in the United States: As long as nobody knows, you can do anything you want, but as soon as it becomes common knowledge, everyone tries to disgrace you. So Bill, did it happen or not? Tell us?

By this time, Clinton was already beginning to show that he knew how not to answer questions. He would not say whether it happened. He was not assertive. He did not say: It is none of your business; my wife and I are not divorced; we are still a family. This is the main problem.

[Orlov] But in politics, nobody ever says: It is none of your business.

[Pozner] It does happen. I will cite some examples later. So this was what happened first. Then another issue surfaced: When you were a student, did you smoke marijuana? At the time—it was during the 1960's—all

American students smoked marijuana. So what does Bill Clinton say? I smoked it, but I did not inhale. [everyone laughs]

[Orlov] You are putting us on.

[Pozner] No, I swear. This phrase became a popular expression. It became a catchword. People even added that you would have to be stupid, because if you smoke it, you ought to at least try it, inhale it. [laughter] No, he smoked it, but he did not inhale.

Then there was the more serious matter about evading military service.

[Zaytseva] Yes, Vietnam.

[Pozner] He used the connections of his father and friends in order to evade Army service. Moreover, as a student at Oxford University in England, he lead demonstrations against U.S. interference in Vietnam. They said he was not a patriot. So once more, was he or was he not? I do not think I led them although I opposed the war! Once more there was nothing specific. Finally, he visited Moscow. Why did he go to Moscow? Was he a KGB agent? Or God knows what else? He twisted, wriggled, and sang, and yet he nevertheless survived. When he was elected [changes thought] besides he was...

[Orlov, interrupting] He was elected instantly; you remember we were on our program at the time, you remember...

[Zaytseva, interrupting] Yes, I was about to say that all of these facts were known during the election campaign.

[Pozner] They were known, and, of course, his opponents tried—they always try—to use these facts, but remember, only 55 percent of all potential voters actually voted—only 55 percent. Of them, 43 percent voted for Clinton. So generally speaking, about 26 percent of the voters cast their ballots for Clinton. This is not a great number, plainly speaking, but their hopes were high. He was a new person; he was young and from a new generation. After all, he plays the saxophone. He even wears sunglasses when the sun is bright. He is from our generation; he is a young man; he will change everything.

So then he came to power. What did he begin with? He began with the issue of whether homosexuals should serve in the Army. Now this was not the main issue in the United States. Americans are concerned with a variety of questions—their pay, employment security, and so forth. Suddenly, this issue appeared on center stage.

They really nailed him on this issue. Senator Nunn, who is one of their military specialists and heads the Senate Armed Services Committee, went so far as to film scenes on board a submarine where everybody sleeps like this [Pozner indicates the proximity of sleeping sailors]. The sailors said: I sleep next to a fairy [goluboy]? Never in my life. There was a great hue and cry, and public opinion turned against him, and Clinton retreated. In other words, at first he said: Let them serve like anybody else;

everyone has the right to defend their homeland, regardless of their sexual preferences. Now it was: Let us do it this way—we will not ask them, and they will not have to tell anyone. This was his first concession, and then there was one concession after another. This was the first.

Take Bosnia-Herzegovina. We will defend the Bosnians, we cannot permit the killing of women and children. We will go talk with the Europeans and start bombing. The Europeans said: No. Suddenly, it was: We will not drop bombs; it is none of our business; we do not have any interests there. This was concession number two.

Then there was three, the issue of appointments, of a certain Lani Guinier in particular. She is a wonderful lawyer and is half—her father is black and her mother is white. He knows her very well because they studied together at Yale University. He recommended her for the post of head of the Human Rights Department of the U.S. Attorney General's Office, if we translate the department's name to Russian realities. Conservative senators raised a hue and cry that she is too minorities, that she worries too much about ensuring equality, even to the point of being a little in favor of minorities. So he appears on television and says: Ladies and gentlemen, unfortunately, I had not read everything Lani Guinier has written and I regret this now, because if I had read it, I certainly would not have nominated her. So now I must withdraw her nomination. This is his friend?

[Orlov] You need not tell us about how and where [words indistinct] friends of politicians [passage indistinct in which all speak at once].

[Pozner] How politicians abandon their friends under pressure, you understand. This is what happened, and, of course, people saw this and ask: What is going on? Where, after all, he is the President; he should demonstrate some forcefulness; he should say: This is the way it will be.

I will remind you that in 1947, Harry Truman—we always vilified him—said: There will be no more segregation in the Army. Before that, blacks were separated. They did not fight alongside whites and lived in separate barracks.

[Orlov] There were separate units as I recall.

[Pozner] Completely separate. There was a hue and cry. What, live with blacks? In the same barracks? We have to take showers with them? Why, never in my life! Now this was right before a presidential election. Truman said: This is how I said it would be, so that is how it will be. And what do you think? That is what he did and he won the election. This is forcefulness; this is the kind of forcefulness Clinton does not have.

He wants everybody to like him. He is very intelligent, but he wants to have his cake and eat it too. He is trying... [changes thought] I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but he somehow reminds me a little of

Gorbachev, in his later period, when he wanted to be liked by both the conservatives and the so-called democrats. That is the story, and so now 36 percent... [changes thought] The fact of the matter is that everyone is already saying that the President is finished. He has dug himself a hole so deep that he will never be able to get out of it, because nobody respects him.

[Zaytseva] This opinion has formed in just five months?

[Pozner] Yes, but I am only an observer of this. Of course, people change.

[Orlov] Four years remain, or three and a half.

[Pozner, interrupting] Not a full four years. Of course, if he manages to turn the economy around. Many people in the United States are suffering because of this right now. If things improve, if he manages to get the deficit under control, then he will certainly be forgiven; people will forget—but right now, the situation...

[Orlov, interrupting] (?There is also) the loan to Russia.

[Pozner] This is the only thing for which everybody is giving him kudos, that he demonstrated...

[Zaytseva, interrupting] Until he retreats again.

[Pozner] Yes, until he does, but he did show determination on this question. Sixty-two percent of Americans said they have enough problems of their own and that there is no need to give so much help to Russia, but he said: It is in our interests; we must do this; and we will do this. This is the only issue he has not compromised on.

Of course, Congress has not yet debated the issue of aid to Russia, and anything might happen. In other words, if several senators get up and say it is not in our interests after all and put pressure on him, he could conceivably back-peddle again, because he does this all the time. Let us wait and see.

[Orlov] How can relations be built in this situation?

[Pozner] It is difficult to build relations. In fact, all of Europe is talking about this. After all, Europe looks to the United States as the leading power and follows the lead. So who will lead it? The United States is supposedly the only superpower and talks about this all the time. Yet now what? It is hard to understand.

[Orlov] Maybe it would be better with no superpowers?

[Pozner] Possibly this would not be too bad.

[Orlov] Maybe like Great Britain? But these are major issues, and we cannot raise them during the little time that we have left to us for this discussion, although these observations undoubtedly may be interesting for those who specifically study the United States and an eye-opener for those who simply view our programs without any professional interest.

[Pozner] I hope so. At any rate, there are people who say they are not interested in politics, particularly international politics. You may not be interested in politics, but politics are interested in you, and whether you like it or not, they will get your attention.

[Orlov] That is for you. [laughter] Thank you for your story.

[Zaytseva] Thank you.

[Pozner] Thank you.

PRAVDA Presents Arguments Against START II

*PM2406101993 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Jun 93 p 6*

[Candidate of Mathematicophysical Sciences Vladimir Mironov article under "To Disarm, But Sensibly" rubric: "Who Needs the START II Treaty?"]

[Text] On 18 March KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, the central organ of the Russian Ministry of Defense, carried the article "Why Our Country Needs the START II Treaty" by Lieutenant General Ananly Politsyn.

I wish to analyze the author's train of thought. The lieutenant general makes some claims and then cites his arguments in support of them. Let us take the author's lead.

The chief question is this: How many nuclear charges and of which kinds does our country need to have in order to ensure its security? Let us leave aside political considerations, which can cause nothing but a headache. For example: Where these charges must be directed if the Russian president maintains that they are not targeted on the United States and if he now considers the United States his ally (it is better to keep quiet altogether about the U.S. position with regard to its newfound "ally"). Maybe even one nuclear charge is too many for us if we are surrounded only by friends? Let us analyze the military, technical, and economic aspects of the theses of the article's author. Let us show the author's arguments for START II and also the counterarguments against it.

First thesis. Some 3,000 (even 2,500) charges are sufficient for Russia.

For. Our weapons will mainly be mobile, and the United States is reducing its nuclear potential, so that it will be inadequate to destroy our strategic forces.

Against. Our mobile complexes differ substantially from the original idea of the U.S. MX complex, according to which a missile is housed in a "subway," which conveys it between dozens of underground, well-defended launch positions. There is no need to destroy our mobile complexes with nuclear weapons. It is quite sufficient simply to "overturn" ["uronit"] the car carrying the Topol or to blow a couple of wheels off the tow truck transporting the missile.

For. These weapons are sufficient to defend Russia and its allies in the commonwealth, since the United States does not have a good ABM system.

Against. The Gulf war showed that the existing Patriot ABM system successfully fulfills the role of an ABM system. At the same time this system knocks out a less vulnerable kind of missile—operational-tactical missiles, whose approach time is exponentially less than that of a strategic missile. In addition, the United States interprets the ABM Treaty in a narrow sense—as a ban only on ABM missile systems. Therefore it cannot be ruled out that by the year 2003 it will possess an ABM system based on different physical principles.

For. There must be a good intelligence system and a system to warn of a missile attack, and then it is possible to reduce charges to the level set by the START II Treaty.

Against. Precisely this is an argument in favor of not reducing strategic nuclear weapons without such a system. But, under the same ABM Treaty, this system can be located along the borders of the country (the USSR), i.e. mostly outside Russia.

Second thesis. The potential of the Strategic Rocket Forces must not be maintained at the level of START I.

For. Missiles with multiple reentry vehicles are produced in collaboration with nearby foreign countries, and heavy missiles with 10 multiple reentry vehicles in Ukraine.

Against. The author presupposes that modern arms systems exist which are produced without collaboration with nearby foreign countries. The naivete of this viewpoint of the author is perplexing.

For. The missile service warranty periods expire by the year 2003, and ecology does not permit the risk of keeping old missiles on alert duty.

Against. The Strategic Rocket Forces consist not only of missiles but also of costly underground launch complexes, hardened against the eventuality of even a nuclear attack, whose operating life certainly cannot expire by 2003. A characteristic and close example is the ground launch complex from which Soyuzes have now been blasting into space for decades.

By regularly carrying out test launches of rockets, it will be possible to ascertain their fitness for combat use at no special cost.

The author's adherence to the warranty period gives rise to a number of everyday questions. If the warranty period of a television set, refrigerator, radio receiver, or motor vehicle expires—it is, as a rule, one year—does he throw all this out onto the dump? Before getting into his official Volga, does he ask the driver: "Has the car's warranty expired today?" Most likely he does not. So why, then, is he prepared to dump valuables created by millions of people over decades? Therefore, in the

existing economic situation for our peoples, it is more useful to reach agreement on the production of heavy missiles for Russia in Ukraine than to develop such a missile anew here.

For. It is cheaper to build 10 missiles with a single warhead than one missile with 10, and single warheads are better.

Against. It will once again be necessary to mention launches. So, 10 missiles means 10 crews, 10 support systems, etc. If what the author advocates were fair, we would have to remove Kalashnikov assault rifles from the arsenal at once and arm the army with single-shot rifles. They are accurate, long-range, and strong, and the mujahidin fought with them, after all.

Third thesis. We must not reduce the level of our nuclear potential outside the START II framework.

For. This will lead to the total elimination of the country's nuclear status.

Against. The systematic scrapping of hardware never leads to a disaster if systematic work is carried out to replace it naturally—with more economical and efficient models.

Fourth thesis. Reductions must be carried out only within the START II framework—this is the most effective means of ensuring the country's security.

For. No arguments.

Against. Further down in the same article we read: "It seems that we would be unable to attain this level (1,300 charges in the Strategic Rocket Forces) by 2003—economic factors would prevent this." Where is the general's logic? He has just written that START II is the most effective means of reducing nuclear arms. But then, suddenly—the country's entire might will be insufficient to bring the Strategic Rocket Forces into line with the START II Treaty after the reductions. Thus, START II envisages not a reduction in Russia's existing Strategic Rocket Forces, but rather their rout.

Fifth thesis. The aviation component of Russia's strategic nuclear means will remain the same: 350-500 warheads.

For. The word "obvious."

Against. There is nothing obvious here. Which aircraft will carry these charges? Tu-95, Tu-160? But, according to the president, we no longer make them. If missiles will have gone out of commission by 2003, what can be said about aircraft, which must not stand still, like missiles, but must fly? The author does not admit that Ukraine will supply us with missiles, but he is absolutely certain, to judge from his estimates, that it will let us have strategic bombers.

Sixth thesis. There will be more charges on submarine-launched ballistic missiles than in the Strategic Rocket Forces.

For. Arguments are not cited, as this is written in the START II Treaty.

Against. If this happens, will it benefit us? A submarine is a "taxi" for missiles, while a ground launch is their home. Is it cheaper to travel by taxi all day long or to stay at home all day? The answer is obvious. So, does no one travel by taxi? Yes, they do. But who? Rich people. But what about the poor? They sit at home. Even if they have a car, it is mainly laid up. Just think for yourselves: Whose submarines will be on alert duty in the ocean, and whose will lie at their moorings? A nuclear-powered submarine at its moorings is not a weapon but a potential Chernobyl for the country off whose coast it is moored because, in addition to missiles, it also has a nuclear reactor on board.

The general also saw the treaty's shortcomings. In his opinion, there are three.

First, the United States still has the possibility of quickly restoring the number of charges on missiles. Second, the United States will be able to put back into commission up to 100 nuclear-capable heavy bombers. Third, sea- and air-launched cruise missiles are not taken into consideration.

It is impossible to disagree with this, but the author does not indicate the treaty's chief shortcoming. This is the inequality of the rights of the parties to the treaty—an inequality enshrined in its text. In what does it consist? In this: Russia must **physically destroy** the lion's share of the most effective part of its strategic nuclear weapons. The United States promises **partially to break up but not to destroy** the basis of its strategic nuclear weapons. That is, Russia will be unable, should the need arise, to restore its initial potential for several years, while the United States will restore it within minutes. In the case of heavy bombers it will not be obligatory to do even this. This is a precedent which could have far-reaching consequences. The chief of these is the insuperable desire of one of the sides to conclude START III (if the START II Treaty is ratified), which will be still more inequitable and will, as far as possible, include an article with roughly this substance: "Russia (the CIS) eliminates all its strategic nuclear forces, and the United States pledges not to use the strategic nuclear forces which it has against Russia (the CIS)." It is clear that the general will object to such a treaty, but it will already be too late, so would it not be better for him to think about this today?

It would be interesting to learn how, within the framework of the START II Treaty, the first deputy chief of the Center for Military Strategic Studies [Ananiy Politsyn] will advise the General Staff to plan a counter strike? How many warheads will there be, in his opinion, on board the Minuteman missile flying toward Russia? One or three? If there is one warhead, such a General

Staff is not worth a plugged nickel; but if there are three, such a treaty is not worth a plugged nickel.

U.S. Ambassador Visits Nizhniy Novgorod

LD2606210893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1956 GMT 26 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Evald Kessariiskiy]

[Text] Nizhniy Novgorod June 26 TASS—U.S. Ambassador to Russia Thomas Pickering visited Nizhniy Novgorod today with a group of embassy staffers to acquaint himself with the ancient city and meet regional administration heads.

The head of the U.S. Agency for International Development, who came to town together with the delegation, aimed to study the progress of regional reforms, as the United States plans purpose-oriented allocations for the region to implement local programs on small and medium businesses, social sphere of the converted enterprises and improvement of agriculture.

Yeltsin on First Official Visit to Greece

Visit Previewed

PM2906191193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 93 p 1

[Boris Vinogradov article: "Greece Greets Russian President"]

[Excerpts] The Russian president's first visit to Greece, beginning Tuesday, promises to be highly successful even if only because it was preceded by lengthy preparatory work between the relevant departments in the two countries during which, according to A. Kozyrev, the "tremendous spiritual potential uniting our peoples" was brought into play. [passage omitted]

On the theme of the "Bosnian conflict," the diplomats have given assurances that there are quite enough points of contact in the two countries' positions. At a time of tension in the Caucasus and the Balkans, Athens believes, Russia's influence could be a stabilizing factor.

Greece, thanks to its geographical position and political status, can also make a significant contribution to the settlement of the conflict.

Greece is a member of the EC, NATO, and the Western European Union [as published] and has a high standing in the international arena. This factor is also taken into account by Russia, which recently issued a new statement on ways to achieve peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina. At the same time, Athens publications have been noting that it depends on the Greek side alone whether the potential resulting from the "awakening of Moscow" and its desire to perform a regulating mission in the Balkans is used. Recently, I KATHIMERINI writes, Russia has persistently and weightily been confirming its presence in this region, a traditional zone of influence for it.

Besides agreements of an economic nature, it seems that in Athens the sides will sign a document relating to military cooperation, which, as A. Kozyrev pointed out, is considered an important point for Moscow since "this is a NATO country and a breakthrough in this area is very desirable for Russia."

Relations Examined

PM3006090193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 3

[Mikhail Pogorelyy report: "Russia Has a Lot To Offer Greece"]

[Text] The view that Greece has everything, which is impressed upon our consciousness following the example set by the classics, does not quite correspond to reality. This is precisely why the Greek Republic is so open to developing economic, political, and cultural links with close and distant neighbors, and with traditional and new partners.

Despite its youth as an independent state, you cannot describe Russia as either a new or a distant partner of Greece. And history itself is to "blame" for this. Just as the knights of the Middle Ages swept into Palestine "to seize the Lord's burial place," so too were freedom-loving Russians eternally striving toward the southern Balkans—not just to help fellow Orthodox believers, but also to defend in battle the ideals of freedom and independence. So it is that so many Russians are buried on Greek soil.... Likewise, it was in Russia that tens, nay hundreds of thousands of Greeks found islets of safety and freedom in the years when political reaction raged in their motherland.

The unquenchable thirst for freedom also forced the Greek leadership to pursue its own (and, as it frequently proved, the most realistic) policy in that era when our countries were on different sides of the ideological barricades, and in the different military-political alliances of the period of confrontation. That period has already run its course, but balance and realism continue to characterize Greek foreign policy, as is amply and clearly demonstrated, for instance, in approaches to the Yugoslav conflict. The Russian and Greek stances coincide on many points here.

As regards the economy, however, the position is more complex. At last week's international conference in Athens, Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis announced that businessmen from his country have set up 31 enterprises in conjunction with their Russian colleagues. By way of a comparison we will take Romania, with whom 714 such ventures have been set up. Can it really be the case that Russia and Greece have nothing to offer each other? Of course they do.

For many years we supplied Greece with cars and trolley buses, oil, gas, and aluminum. In turn, Greece supplied us not only with citrus fruits and their juices, but also with textile goods, and machine-building equipment. It

was common practice for our ships to be serviced and maintained in Greek ports and dockyards. What is hindering this process today?

Obviously, one problem resides in the weakness of the legal basis for multilateral cooperation between our countries. A long-term program to develop economic, industrial, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and the Greek Republic, which was signed 10 years ago, expired at the beginning of this year. Likewise, many clauses in the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation concluded two years ago—again between the Soviet Union and Greece—have lost their force.

The conclusion of new legal and contractual documents must stand as one of the paramount tasks of the official visit to Greece by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, which is just beginning. But all of this, although very important, is but a formality. As Athens' leaders note, our countries are linked by long-standing cooperation, and there are close bonds between the peoples, and between the hearts of people. These are alive, even without protocols....

The unofficial thrust of the first ever visit to Greece by the head of Russia is to provide new impetus in establishing firm partnership relations between countries which do indeed have something to offer one another: not only industrial, handicraft, and agricultural goods, but also a wealth of spiritual culture, and a community of views on the world.

Notes Topics of Interest During Visit

LD2906162593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1607 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Vladimir Suprun]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—President Boris Yeltsin of Russia flew off on Tuesday [29 Jun] evening for Athens on an official visit. This is the first visit by the Russian leader to Greece.

Before his departure, Yeltsin told reporters he was firmly convinced that the forthcoming talks would appear highly effective. "We have thoroughly elaborated dozens of documents, which inspires us with the hope that our visit will turn out successful", the president said.

We face great difficulties in developing our relations with such structures as CSCE, the Council of Europe and European Communities, which make discriminative demands on Russia, Yeltsin pointed out. Therefore, in his opinion, more concrete results may be achieved through concluding bilateral agreements with foreign countries, "especially with such countries as Greece, whose history, spirit, traditions and culture are close to ours", he emphasised.

Among the issues to be discussed during the stay of the Russian delegation in Greece, Yeltsin cited the current situation in former Yugoslavia. "This problem greatly affects Greece as a neighbouring country", the Russian

leader noted. According to him, the approaches of Moscow and Athens to the resolution of the Yugoslavian crisis are practically identical, therefore "we shall have no difficulties on this matter during the talks", Yeltsin stressed.

Greek Prime Minister Assesses Visit

LD2906182893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1545 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Malyshev]

[Text] Athens, June 29 (TASS)—The Greek-Russian relations have a long history in all spheres—political, social and religious. It is proved by historical documents and memories of both peoples, Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis told ITAR-TASS today, commenting on an official Greek visit of Russian President Boris Yeltsin that begins today.

Certainly, the first Greek visit of the Russian president is an important step in this direction, stressed the Greek premier. At the political level, it is very important to encourage constant contacts between the governments and upkeep an open communications channel now that the region is painfully changing and numerous problems are arising.

The premier noted all of them should work to further improve bilateral economic and cultural relations at the state and individual levels. The past showed this is a natural way to consolidate bilateral relations, and the Greek official is sure the two countries should further follow it.

State initiatives and laws facilitate these efforts, still the role of individual initiative should not be underestimated.

Saying Greece is the only Balkan state, which is a member of the EC and NATO, the prime minister said it wants to use economic possibilities and political relations to become a bridge between the Balkans and the rest of Europe, contribute to peace, stability and economic development in the region.

In his opinion, Russia, which has traditional political and religious relations with all peoples of the region, can play an important stabilizing role in the Balkans in close cooperation with Greece. The common goal of the two states is to prevent changes of national borders with the use of force, as well as revival of nationalism and religious confrontation.

Both countries support the use of common criteria in protection of ethnic and religious minorities and groups in former Yugoslavia. They also understand possible negative influence of states, which may lead to further destabilization in the Balkans due to their fragmentary understanding of realities and history or due to their past catastrophic presence in the region.

Mitsotakis praised Russian involvement in building united Europe through signing agreements on cooperation and partnership. Russia is a European state and it should maintain close relations with the European Community.

Being a member-state and further chairman of the European Community, Greece will do its best to consolidate relations and cooperation with Russia.

Yeltsin Meets President Karamanlis

LD2906191593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1855 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Vladimir Malyshev, Gennadiy Talalayev, and Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] Athens, 29 Jun—Russia's President Boris Yeltsin, who arrived here today on an official visit, tonight met with Greece's President Konstandinos Karamanlis.

Russian presidential press secretary Vaycheslav Kostikov told ITAR-TASS correspondents that the meeting was held in a "very warm and friendly atmosphere." The fact that the conversation lasted longer than was planned testifies that the two heads of state found many topics for an interesting and constructive dialogue, the spokesman said. In his words, the Russian president was especially keen to learn about Greece's experience in its transition from dictatorship to democracy.

Takes Part in Official Ceremonies

LD3006085393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0831 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Vladimir Malyshev, Gennadiy Talalayev, and Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] Athens June 30 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin, on an official visit to Greece, placed a wreath at the unknown soldier's tomb in the heart of the Greek capital on Wednesday, the second day of his official visit. The wreath-laying ceremony took place in the presence of Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis and other officials.

Then the presidential motorcade went to the Acropolis. The ceremony to commemorate the activity of the first Greek parliament formed in times of ancient Greece will be held on the legendary Pnyx [as received] hill.

As it was already reported, President Yeltsin had a meeting with Greek President Konstandinos Karamanlis on Tuesday evening. A report of the press service of the Greek president circulated here says that bilateral relations, the situation in the Balkans and in former Yugoslavia, as well as the Cyprus problem, were discussed during the conversation. It is noted that the meeting passed in the spirit of traditional friendship between the two peoples.

Friendship, Cooperation Treaty Signed

LD3006113993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1031
GMT 30 Jun 93

[By unidentified ITAR-TASS correspondents]

[Text] Athens June 30 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis concluded negotiations on Wednesday by signing a treaty on friendship and cooperation.

The document lays the foundation for a fruitful development of relations between Greece and democratic Russia and outlines the basic directions of bilateral ties in all spheres.

Agreements on economic, scientific and technical cooperation, as well as on merchant shipping, on protection of cultural heritage and others were also signed.

Kiev's Stance on U.S. Strike Against Iraq Viewed

PM2906183793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jun 93 p 3

[Konstantin Eggert report: "Kiev Condemns U.S. Action in Iraq. Fifty-Three Percent of Americans Favor the Elimination of Saddam Husayn"]

[Excerpt] Ukraine has followed Russia in expressing its viewpoint of the U.S. missile attack on the Iraqi intelligence headquarters. However, Kiev's opinion was diametrically opposed to Moscow's position, which, as is well known, fully supports the U.S. action.

"The Ukrainian Foreign Ministry regrets that the U.S. missile attack on Baghdad resulted in civilian casualties. It is regrettable that this new outbreak of violence, accompanied by innocent victims, has added to the list of dangerous and unresolved conflicts," the official statement from Kiev says. As REUTER reports, Anatoliy Zlenko, head of Ukraine's diplomatic service, stated: "No state has the right to punish another without the appropriate consent of international organizations, first and foremost, the United Nations."

Many tend to regard this move as being prompted by fear that America's strong-arm action in the Near East will set an example to other great powers, primarily Russia, which has been engaged in a protracted dispute with Ukraine over the nuclear legacy of the USSR. However, the new position of the Ukrainian leadership, which previously approved of the action of the United States and its allies in the anti-Iraq coalition, could halt the thaw which had just begun in relations between Kiev and Washington. ■

Meanwhile, U.S. public opinion as a whole approves of the raid on Baghdad. In a Gallup poll, 62 percent of those questioned expressed the view that the decision to launch a missile attack on the Iraqi capital was correct. Some 53 percent of respondents are convinced that the United States should try to eliminate Saddam Husayn.

This is clearly what the Clinton administration would like, too. However, high-ranking politicians in Washington are quite openly acknowledging that any attempt at the physical destruction of Saddam will lead to the collapse of the entire system headed by him and will create chaos in the country. In that event Iraq could disintegrate into a Shiite fundamentalist state in the south and the central regions and a Kurdish state in the north. The next stage in the development of the situation would be an increase in separatist feelings among the Kurds in Turkey, Iraq [as published], and Syria and the inevitable retaliatory measures from Ankara, Tehran, and Damascus. No one wants that kind of destabilization of the situation in the region. In addition, as former CIA Director Robert Gates acknowledges, the United States has virtually no levers left for influencing the internal situation in Iraq. Several military plots against President Husayn have ended in failure and the execution of the participants. [passage omitted]

Chernomyrdin's Ukraine Visit Resolves Some Economic Issues

LD3006092593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0856
GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"There is a feeling that relations between Russia and Ukraine have become much more cordial," vice-chairman of Russia's State Cooperation Committee Marat Khusnutdinov said, commenting on the results of a working visit to Ukraine by Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.

The talks in Kiev were preceded by a meeting of experts from interested ministries and departments of both countries at which a number of important documents were signed, Khusnutdinov said. The meeting showed a concordance of stands on many key aspects of economic cooperation between the two sovereign states, he said.

That is why an important big step has been taken in the direction of further economic rapprochement, Marat Khusnutdinov noted. According to him, Viktor Chernomyrdin's visit has resolved a number of acute problems which had accumulated during the past few months. These, in particular, include the already signed agreements on free trade, providing a 250 billion rouble credit to Ukraine in 1993 which will be repaid over a three year period, as well as cooperation in the development of the Russian oil and gas industry.

Undoubtedly, accords on questions of customs policy, natural gas prices and tariffs of its transportation, including to West European countries, are of great importance, especially under present circumstances, according to the vice-chairman of the Russian State Cooperation Committee. The price of gas, as has been noted in the adopted agreement, must be raised to the world price level by January 1, 1994, he said.

Protocols on setting up joint Russo-Ukrainian transnational economic structures and changes in permitted

quotas for gas supplies to Ukraine also promote economic cooperation between the two countries. The guarantee protocol regarding problems of using nuclear fuel in Ukrainian nuclear power plants is also of great significance. In compliance with this, Russia's Atomic Energy Ministry and Ukraine's State Committee of Atomic Energy should prepare a document on prices of fresh nuclear fuel for Ukrainian nuclear power plants, as well as on prices of the receipt and recycling of the spent nuclear fuel in them, Marat Khusnutdinov said.

Leadership Seen Toughening Stance on Estonia

PM2806121793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 93 p 1

[Sergey Knyazkov article: "Russia No Longer Intends To Tolerate Humiliation of Russians in Estonia"]

[Text] Despite the process of negotiations between Russia and Estonia, which is apparently developing successfully, Tallinn's official steps have recently been increasingly contradicting the accords achieved with respect to disputed questions. The law on elections to organs of local self-management debarred the Russian-speaking population from participating in them even in regions densely populated by Russians. Estonia is persisting in its territorial claims on Russia, seeking to restore the 1920 borders. The city councils of Tallinn and Narva have adopted decisions to evict from their apartments persons connected with the Armed Forces of the former USSR and Russia, military pensioners, and members of their families. Finally, the State Assembly of the Estonian Republic has adopted a law "On Aliens" which is unprecedentedly harsh and declares all immigrants—one-third of the republic's population—to be aliens who are obliged to ask the authorities for a residence permit. According to the law, these people, the overwhelming majority of whom are Russian, will have to renew their residence permit every five years and be virtually under open surveillance by the police. For their part, the authorities are not obliged to automatically grant a residence permit and are able, at any moment, to annul one, to refuse to issue one, or to refuse to extend one. At the same time the law prohibits, as a rule, the issuing of a residence permit to reserve and retired officers of foreign armies and to members of their families.

It is not hard to realize what Tallinn is seeking by toughening its policy toward the Russian-speaking population resident in the republic. By humiliating these people, however, and putting them in the position of "second-class" people, Estonia is also insulting Russia, forcing it to take countermeasures to protect its compatriots abroad.

"Does Tallinn really think that Russia's soldiers will calmly withdraw from the country at a time when Russians are being evicted from apartments in Estonia's cities with the help of the police?"—Vitaliy Churkin,

Russian Federation deputy foreign minister, put this rhetorical question to journalists at a briefing 23 June.

Yes, until recently Moscow was evidently reckoning that common sense would nonetheless prevail in Estonian politics, which are thoroughly permeated with nationalism, and was in no hurry to use against Tallinn the sanctions that are usual in international practice.... Moral considerations undoubtedly played a definite role here: There are, in any case, people in Russia's leadership today who did a great deal to assert Estonia's independence. But there is a limit to everyone's patience. Speaking to ITAR-TASS Wednesday, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev described Estonia's present policy as "apartheid" leading to "ethnic cleansing." Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin issued a tough statement Thursday. It states, in particular, that the recent actions to limit the rights of the Russian-speaking population "are of a nature that is unfriendly toward Russia." With the adoption of the law "On Aliens" in Estonia, it goes on to point out, we are virtually "talking of a practice of ethnic cleansing and the introduction of an Estonian version of apartheid."

"Russia regards the adoption of the law 'On Aliens' as a deliberate violation by the Estonian side of the balance of relations which has taken shape between Russia and Estonia and of the existing political and diplomatic accords. The principle of good-neighborliness has been put in jeopardy." "Russia's leadership," Boris Yeltsin's statement reads, "will take all necessary measures to protect its national interests and to guard the Russian-speaking population against political, social, and police arbitrariness. The relevant agencies have been instructed to undertake a package of measures to ensure the protection of the honor, dignity, and legitimate rights of our compatriots, including servicemen, military pensioners, workers of military enterprises, and members of their families."

Urging "the Estonian side to reconsider its position with regard to Russians," the Russian Federation president warns that "all responsibility for a possible violation of civilian peace in Estonia will lie with Estonia's leadership."

Estonian Law Aimed at 'Deportation'

LD2906081493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0751 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Fomicheva]

[Text] St. Petersburg June 29 TASS—"A law on foreigners adopted in Estonia is aimed at the deportation of the Russian-speaking population," the St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak told ITAR-TASS.

"Evidently, Estonia was offended by the West, from which it expected considerable financial aid, and in this way it is attempting to draw the attention of the world public," Sobchak said.

"I believe the Russian Foreign Ministry should appeal to the Northern Council, to which Estonia has just been admitted, asking to expel Estonia from this organization since the policy of this Baltic country against the Russian-speaking population is harder than apartheid in South Africa," the mayor said.

In Sobchak's opinion, Lithuania has set an example for normal relations between former Soviet Republics. "There were problems several years ago, but now that the president was elected who has a great deal of common sense, our countries have managed to come to terms. St. Petersburg is paying part of Lithuania's debts for oil and gas, while Lithuania is supplying agricultural products to St. Petersburg at prices lower than in other regions," Sobchak said.

Yastrzhembskiy on Russians' Rights

LD2906132693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1237 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Ryabikin and Aleksandr Smelyakov]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun—The Russian Federation will continue to insistently advocate, both on a bilateral level and in the international arena, the observance of the civil rights of the nonindigenous inhabitants of Estonia, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry Press and Information Department, said at a briefing for Russian and foreign journalists here today.

He stated that during the recent meetings between Estonian President Lennart Meri, Estonian Foreign Minister Trivimi Velliste, and Aleksey Glukhov, special envoy of the Russian Federation foreign minister and director of the Russian Foreign Ministry's European Department, the Russian Federation representatives gave a fundamental appraisal of specific steps undertaken by Estonia both at the parliamentary and local level "which have led to an escalation of interethnic tension in the country and to heightened fears on the part of the Russian-speaking minority regarding the observance of their civil rights."

Also, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy noted, it was stated as emphatically as possible that further "revivals of territorial claims to Russian lands" was impermissible. Russia's desire and readiness to build good-neighborly, respectful, and equal relations with Estonia was once again affirmed to the Estonian leaders.

During the conversation which took place, the director of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press and Information Department said, the hope was expressed that the Estonian side would take Russia's concern the right way and would take the necessary measures to put relations with Russia right, on the basis of taking mutual account of interests. One got the impression, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy stressed, that the Estonian leadership, at least verbally, was prepared to make certain adjustments to its line on the Russian-speaking population.

The immediate future will show, he pointed out, just how sincere the Estonian authorities are in their promises and how the words about intending to continue the positive dialogue with Russia are put into practice, as well as how the interests and rights of the 500,000 nonindigenous residents are actually taken into account in Estonia.

Document Sent to UN

LD3006090793 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0630 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] A statement by Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin on the crude violation of the rights of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia has been circulated in the United Nations. This is related to the new law on foreigners. In fact, we are witnessing the practice of ethnic cleansing and the introduction of an Estonian version of apartheid, the document says. Russia will take all necessary steps to defend its national interests and to protect the Russian speakers from political, social, and police abuses.

Government May Halt Gas Supplies to Belarus

LD2906214493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1616 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Gordeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun (TASS)—Belarus owes Russia 76 billion rubles [R], and Moldova owes R14 billion for deliveries of natural gas. These figures have been obtained by the ITAR-TASS correspondent from well-informed sources. A similar debt has led to a suspension in gas supplies to the Baltic states. The same source has also reported that a Russian Government conciliatory commission flew to Minsk today to settle "gas" problems with the Belarus side, and to determine prospects for cooperation. However, it is not impossible that this republic may also see its supplies of fuel from Russia stopped, unless the two sides reach an agreement.

Armenian Delegation Signs Agreements in Moscow

NC2906032393 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1900 GMT 28 Jun 93

[Text] An Armenian Government delegation led by Prime Minister Grant Bagratyan paid an official visit to Moscow on 24-25 June. Deputy Premier Vigen Chitechyan, State Minister Gagik Shahbazyan, Tigran Sargsyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on Financial and Budgetary Affairs, Finance Minister Levon Parkhudaryan, First Deputy Foreign Minister Arman Kirakosyan, and other officials were included in the delegation.

It held working meetings with the Russian Government and several agreements were signed on providing state credits to Armenia for 1993, mutual responsibilities and requirements for the use of Russia's ruble in Armenia,

cooperation in the field of industrial ownership, the mutual protection of copyrights, and cooperation on standardization, measurements, and certificates between Armenia and Russia.

Colonel on NATO Targeting Western Border

PM2506133993 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jun 93 p 1

[Interview with Colonel Yevgeniy Morozov by S. Turchenko; place and date not given: "Colonel Yevgeniy Morozov: We Are Weaker Now Than in '41"]

[Text] The sphere of scientific activity of Colonel Yevgeniy Morozov, lecturer in the department of operational art at the Frunze Military Academy, is the state of the defense capability of Russian troops in the Western strategic salient. This was the theme of our discussion on the eve of the 52d anniversary of the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War.

[Turchenko] Yevgeniy Filippovich, the "democrats" who have seized power in the country today often accuse "Stalin's regime" of not having properly prepared defenses in the Western strategic salient in 1941. But what is the situation there today?

[Morozov] To put it briefly—catastrophic. We are weaker now than in '41, incomparably weaker. After the secession of the Baltic countries, Ukraine, and Belarus, the Western border has no natural borders of strategic significance on which it would be possible to create a sufficiently reliable defense. The last such feature before Moscow—the middle course of the Dnieper—is now on the territory of Belarus.

NATO is targeting at our Western strategic salient the forces of the so-called Central European theater of military operations. They number about 36 combined-arms divisions plus 35 separate combined-arms brigades and regiments. In all, 45-48 rated divisions [raschetnaya diviziya], up to 8,500 tanks, and more than 1,500 airplanes and 750 combat helicopters. In the event of a decision to undertake aggression, the complement of this grouping would be brought up to 90 rated divisions and 4,000 combat aircraft within a month.

But our potential adversary has no need to hurry. Even if NATO spends six months on deployment, as during operation "Desert Shield," even then the Russian Armed Forces will not be able to make sufficient preparation to repel the aggression in view of the existence of the so-called strategic scissors between the deployment times of the NATO and Russian armed forces.

[Turchenko] But maybe we have nothing to fear, for after all the "democratic" leaders never tire of repeating that there is no longer a military threat from NATO?

[Morozov] Even if that is so, there is, at any rate, a military danger linked with the presence of a powerful

strategic offensive grouping which in another military-political situation may be used to strike at the heart of Russia. And a change in the military-political situation cannot be ruled out.

But most importantly, in the "strategic scissors" situation an offensive operation by NATO is by no means obligatory. The impossibility of a commensurate Russian response predetermines for our country a humiliating policy of capitulation in the face of military blackmail from the United States.

[Turchenko] Surely we don't have so few forces in the Western strategic salient that they are incapable of countering aggression?

[Morozov] Here is the breakdown, draw your own conclusions. In this region we have only five combined-arms formations, that is, one division compared to eight-12 NATO divisions. Two hundred kilometers of open border per division. According to the laws of normal logic, this grouping should be reinforced at a critical moment. But the government has limited itself in advance to the norms of the Paris treaty: 5,500 tanks and other armaments which suffice only for 20-25 combined units capable of waging a combined-arms battle in a modern war. That is, our "democrats" have guaranteed our potential adversary at least a fourfold superiority in the Western strategic salient.

We cannot redeploy troops and weapons from the Urals before the commencement of military operations insofar as to violate voluntarily assumed obligations could serve as a pretext to aggression. Redeployment of these forces after war breaks out would be rendered extremely problematic by the adversary's creation of a barrier line on the Volga. Even the infrastructure of the region is such that it is ready neither for troop redeployment, nor for combat operations.

But even if everything were normal as regards the composition of the grouping and the infrastructure, the state of the troops is such that, all the same, they are non-combat-ready. The motorized infantry and tank units have not been brought up to strength. Only a quarter of them have more than 50 percent of authorized personnel. In the troops there is a 45-percent shortfall of company and platoon commanders. Combat training is being conducted at an unacceptably low level. Suffice to say that the allotted fuel is sufficient to run only the regimental commander's car and the bread delivery truck....

[Turchenko] The current Russian leadership reassures people that nuclear weapons are the country's guarantee of independence....

[Morozov] But we have after all given a no-first-use undertaking. But NATO, with such superiority of forces, could successfully wage war against us using only conventional weapons. And as it happens, it could destroy our nuclear forces with its high-precision weapons right in the initial period. So this is no guarantee. The only

deterrent factor at the moment is the remnants of the Western Group of Forces [WGF]. However demoralized they are, whatever desperate operational situation they find themselves in.... And so that they do not interfere with NATO's military planning, even the timetable of the WGF's withdrawal is being modified—in the direction of acceleration, naturally. As soon as we have withdrawn, we will be in the total power of NATO, or, to be more precise, the United States.

[Turchenko] Surely there is a decent way out of the situation into which the "democrats" have plunged us?

[Morozov] The position is already such that even the most ideal Ministry of Defense (and the present one is far from that) would be incapable of coping independently with the problems of defense. The state power, soviets of all levels, and the entire people must, as in 1941, set determinedly about this task. There is a pressing need for targeted state programs for the development of defense. The most urgently needed measure is for reinforcement of the troops of the Western strategic salient with WGF units and combined formations, its material stockpiles, and its training and combat property. The accommodation difficulties will be incredible, but there is no other way to make the country invulnerable to military blackmail.

Certain international documents will generate special difficulties. But the vital need for this step demands from the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet or the Congress, first, a statement that the Paris treaty on conventional arms reductions has been superseded by the fundamentally new military-political situation. Second, a proposal to resume disarmament talks in Geneva. It is of no less importance to begin immediately to create sufficient stockpiles of arms, equipment, and material defense resources through placing long-term state orders with enterprises of the military-industrial complex.

As a military specialist who constantly analyzes defense problems, I am profoundly convinced that, if the soviets of all levels and the government do not take urgent, energetic measures, the final loss of state independence awaits us in the near future.

Churkin Discusses Solutions for Bosnian Crisis

AU2906121093 Belgrade RTB Television Network in Serbo-Croatian 1958 GMT 28 June 93

[Interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin by Jasmina Pavlov² Stamenic in Moscow; date not given—recorded; interview conducted in Russian with superimposed translation into Serbo-Croatian]

[Text] [Stamenic] Vitaliy Ivanovic, we shall begin with the Russian Foreign Policy and the attitude toward Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav crisis. As a diplomat, could you define what the strategy is and what are the tactics in this policy?

[Churkin] This is a very interesting question. I believe that the strategy is rather straightforward. We are trying to do all we can to end the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and resolve the problems in the former Yugoslavia in a peaceful, diplomatic manner so that not a single ethnic community involved in this horrible conflict be impaired. A stable solution cannot be found if somebody feels impaired.

Regarding the tactics, this is a very complex issue because we must actually resolve several tactical problems. If Russia was to resolve this problem by itself, that is, to do whatever we consider necessary at this moment and insist on the solution that we consider necessary in a given moment, we would not have achieved anything. I must say that the first understanding that was reached between us and the FRY and Serbian leadership during my numerous trips to Belgrade boiled down precisely to the conclusion that, in order to make the Russian policy efficient, we must avoid confrontation. One of the most important elements in the international efforts is that they must be taken in coordination. If divisions occur within the international community regarding the approach to the Yugoslav crisis—here I am referring to the key members of the international community—this will only lead to the escalation of fighting and lead us away from the strategic goal—to achieve a peaceful, political solution for the former Yugoslavia.

Regarding concrete tactical decisions, it is still too early to talk about them, bearing in mind that the problems are still present and that the negotiations are underway. I might be able to give concrete examples about the very complex situations in which we sometimes had to work once peace is restored and everything is behind us.

[Stamenic] Until yesterday, it seemed that the Vance-Owen plan did not have a feasible alternative. What has changed? What circumstances have changed, from your point of view?

[Churkin] You are absolutely correct. The objective conditions were, for numerous reasons, until quite recently that the Vance-Owen plan represented the only basis for the talks. This was explained with the ratio of basic factors, protagonists, and members of the international community and the attitude of the sides in the talks to the events. For example, not merely the Muslim but also the Croatian side was, until recently, unwilling to discuss any other option that would be different to the Vance-Owen plan. However, it is worth mentioning that, when we were saying that the Vance-Owen plan did not have an alternative for various reasons, this was really the case a few months or even a few weeks ago. However, we have realized clearly enough the difficulties that the Vance-Owen plan was about to encounter from the point of its acceptance by all sides and from the point of the realization of this plan. For this reason we discussed an alternative option together with the cochairmen, the West European countries, and the United States, which would be implemented if the Vance-Owen plan was not endorsed and realized.

The first concentrated attempt to work out an alternative option was made in April. If you recall, in between my trips to Belgrade, I travelled specially to New York, where I met with the leaders of the U.S. Administration, State Department, and the National Security Council in the White House. I also met Vance and Owen when these alternative options were discussed. Then, it was not the right time for other options, for various reasons—it would take me half an hour to tell them all. However, as a result of various circumstances, a moment came sometime in May when the Croatian side, too—we had known the position of the Serbian side well all along—and what is very important, the key members of the international community and the cochairmen also, started to realize that other solutions should be sought.

I believe that a very important circumstance, which I would like to emphasize, is that the leadership in Belgrade absolutely clearly, regardless of how paradoxically this may sound, spoke in favor of the Vance-Owen plan. This is a very important issue of principle. What was this? Was it a mistake? You will recall the message by the three political leaders to the Bosnian Serbs. Was this a mistake for which they will have to apologize in some way or the other in the course of history? I am deeply convinced that this was not a mistake. It was the only possible step in those circumstances, doubtlessly a correct step in that the eyes of the international community, for the first time, portrayed Belgrade as a factor for a peaceful solution, a factor that is working in a feasible and right direction. Although, all the doubts of numerous members of the international community regarding Belgrade's motives have not disappeared yet, while we had earlier measured the manifestations of constructiveness by Belgrade representatives in the talks with crumbs, we then got a serious, momentous step. It seems to me that this was a very significant, psychological and political moment which helped to steer things from the imposition of the Vance-Owen plan in circumstances in which not all sides accepted it, to a resolution at the level at which the talks are currently being held.

[Stamenic] What will be Russia's further steps regarding the Yugoslav crisis and what will Russia do tomorrow?

[Churkin] We wish to continue taking an active part in the negotiations. I am not speaking of the fact that we received the FRY Foreign Minister in Moscow yesterday.

[Stamenic] He called you?

[Churkin] Yes, he called me, but it is very hot over there and I have not (?worked out the map) yet. [sentence as heard] However, I received the Croatian Foreign Minister on Monday. I expect other contacts soon. We are constantly in touch with numerous European countries and the EC. During the session of the European Council in Copenhagen, our Foreign Minister held talks with Danish Foreign Minister for two days running. They discussed various official approaches. I believe that our participation will continue and will be active, just as it

has been so far. I do not rule out the possibility that a stage will come when we will consider it useful for all the sides that we be present on the scene of negotiations.

[Stamenic] From your point of view, what stands the greater chance of success—the idea of confederation in Bosnia-Herzegovina or the solution envisaged by the Vance-Owen plan?

[Churkin] We have now deviated a little from the Vance-Owen plan. I would not like to pass any categorical judgments. First of all, whatever the sides agree we shall hail. Confederation, federation, these are merely words. It is the content of these terms that is very important. The sides should agree about the details. It seems to me that the idea of creating a unified Bosnian state consisting of three national units—Serbian, Muslim, and Croatia—has more perspective today. However, permit me to state the most important opinion. I do not know whether you will ask this or not, but I would definitely like to say it. As a result of the combination of circumstances, and also as a result of great energy invested by the Russian side—if you permit me to say this—the doors have opened for a solution. It is very important that these doors are not shut, as they will not be open for long. It is very important, therefore, that we are not carried away by the details. If the possibility of a solution that contains the basic, important elements emerges, then we must forget about some details.

For example, as I understand, the Bosnian Serbs have always harbored, as their fundamental interest, the idea of territorial unity within Bosnia-Herzegovina. You will recall the issues concerning the northern corridor, which was much debated. A solution is now opening for them to achieve territorial unity. In these circumstances we must show more flexibility toward some territorial issues and not try to, as this would be the case in normal circumstances, come out with maximal demands and then quarrel about them for a long time. It seems to me that it would be a tragic mistake if the Serbian and the Croatian sides opt for this way, as the doors for the possibilities, which are now ajar—since the Muslim side is not willing to negotiate on the details of this plan yet—will close and the options for Bosnia-Herzegovina will be very bleak.

[Stamenic] These open doors mean that the stories about the use of force against Serbia and Yugoslavia are now becoming meaningless?

[Churkin] The negotiations are now underway. If these negotiations are unsuccessful, and that is what I am referring to when I speak of the possibility of these doors closing, all these stories will reemerge. For instance, several countries, mostly the nonaligned countries, are putting forward a draft resolution in the UN Security Council for the abolition of the arms embargo. This refers to the delivery of arms to the Bosnian Government. I would like to say here that, when assessing the present situation, even in the circumstances when the

talks seem to have been taking place, we must not indulge in euphoria. We must remain very serious. Numerous countries insist on the delivery of arms and the resolution of the problems in Bosnia-Herzegovina by force. We oppose this very resolutely. We are against such a logic and I must say that we are not isolated in this. However, a very serious diplomatic and political struggle continues on all these issues. The most extremist proposals and ideas will reemerge as soon as it appears that the possibility of a peaceful solution has vanished and the conflict will escalate again.

[Stamenic] What is the Russian position on the U.S. soldiers in Macedonia?

[Churkin] This decision by the international community, supporting the widening of the contingent of U.S. soldiers in Macedonia, is based on the reasons of stability in Macedonia and comes at the request of the Macedonian leadership. We supported this idea, together with other members of the international community. At the same time, we expressed a certain concern in our diplomatic contacts with the Americans and the European countries. We pointed out that, simultaneously with the widening of the U.S. contingent, a correct signal should be given as to why all this was happening. This happened in the interest of Macedonia's stability. Under no circumstances should this be perceived by any side outside Macedonia as a step toward more extreme actions. I cannot dot the i's. It is no big secret that we are worried that this widening could be misinterpreted by the extremist elements among the Kosovo Albanians, who might interpret this as a call for a transition to some extremist measures in the realization of their political goals.

It seems to me that we will succeed in making sure that this U.S. action be correctly understood and that it does not have negative consequences.

[Stamenic] The Russian military contingent will not increase?

[Churkin] Not for the time being. As you know, we have one unit in Croatia. We believe that the participation of the Russian soldiers in these peace keeping actions in Bosnia would be important on the political plane, but for the time being I do not conceal that we have problems here with our military, who say that, until a peaceful solution is found, they do not wish to expose our soldiers to risk and send a new Russian contingent.

We now continue to examine the situation that is emerging with them and I believe that if a peaceful solution is found, then the interest of the Serbian side for the Russian troops to take part in this UN peace keeping operation, which we will definitely have to realize there... [changes thought] I hope that we will be able to meet this request by the leadership of the Bosnian Serbs. However, for the time being, our military tells us that once there is a peaceful solution they will be willing to take part in the military protection.

[Stamenic] You met our Federal Minister Jovanovic and spoke of the possibility of suspending the sanctions during the process of negotiations. What is your stand on this?

[Churkin] I view this possibility positively, but I also want to tell you one thing completely openly and directly: Russia is today the only country to occasionally speak up at international forums, in the United Nations or elsewhere, to the effect that one should consider either lifting or reducing the sanctions against Yugoslavia. From time to time, one can hear a diplomat say unofficially that they have understanding for this idea, but when it comes to official discussions, Russia is the only country to raise the question officially. Therefore, in my opinion, it is realistically possible to touch upon the subject of lifting or reducing the sanctions only when a peaceful solution [regulisanje] is reached and when it begins to be implemented. At that moment, the sanctions will really begin to be gradually reduced and then lifted.

[Stamenic] In your opinion, simply your personal opinion as a man, not only as a diplomat, what do you think, has the international community made any mistakes concerning Serbia and Yugoslavia and if it did, what are they?

[Churkin] I would not like to speak about that now, as everything that happened in the former Yugoslavia is a major lesson. However, it is a lesson, above all, not only for the international community, but also for the very peoples living in Yugoslavia. I speak in the spirit of openness and directness with which I suppose I always conduct talks. It sometimes seems to me that, when such a question is posed, when people are trying to transfer the responsibility for everything that has happened in the former Yugoslavia onto the international community and onto certain countries, that we should then face the truth and say that, first of all, in this tragedy the blame lies on these peoples themselves and the forces, political and other, that allowed [corrects himself] that led the situation in the former Yugoslavia to this tragic conflict that is going on at the moment. At the same time, one should admit that the international community did not at all act in an ideal way in regulating this conflict and that it did not act up to the situation, when attempts at regulating the situation failed to bring speedy results, so, let me repeat this, we all have to draw lessons from what has happened.

[Stamenic] Finally, our journalists say that your hair has turned grey since you begun dealing with the Yugoslav issues as a special envoy. What do you say to this?

[Churkin] I am not thinking about my grey hair so much, but I must say that I felt great responsibility during the hardest moments of recent months. I would be thinking about this at night, and there have probably been few such foreign political problems that Russia was pulled into that provoked so much reaction and had so many

serious negative consequences both for the foreign political interests of Russia and for the peace in Yugoslavia and the Balkans on the political plane [as heard]. They are really very complex, so this burden of responsibility was sometimes seriously pressing on me. [Churkin laughs] Perhaps my head as well. However, prospects are opening now, which are encouraging. The situation is considerably better regarding perspectives and solutions than it was a month ago. Let us watch the future with optimism. This is why one must work with responsibility and effort.

[Stamenic] Thank you very much.

Khasbulatov Meets With BBC Chairman

LD2906210693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Jun 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Ruslan Khasbulatov today met Marmaduke Hussey, chairman of the Board of Governors of the BBC. The British guest recounted how his radio and television company acquired real independence and impartiality in covering events and has become one of the most popular and respected companies in the world. Today the BBC is trusted not only by television viewers in different countries but by their politicians as well. Naturally both the Russian television and radio companies have a long way to go before they achieve that.

In the opinion of Ruslan Khasbulatov, our television is in the power of blatant and severe propaganda, under the oppression of censorship on the part of the government. It is extremely difficult to change that situation. The chairman of the parliament did not have any specific solutions to this, other than listening to the BBC.

Kozyrev Meets EC Ambassadors in Moscow

LD2906150993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1313 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—A regular meeting of Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev with ambassadors of EC member states in Moscow was held here on Tuesday [29 June].

The participants in the meeting discussed prospects for the development of relations between Russia and the European communities in the light of a proposed agreement on partnership and cooperation, as well as problems concerning the forthcoming Tokyo summit of the group of seven major industrial nations and Russia.

Eureka Membership Promises 'Real Economic Benefits'

PM2906122593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Aleksey Portanskiy report: "Russia Has Become a Participant in the 'Eureka' Program"]

[Text] The Russian Federation has been accepted into the ranks of participant countries in "Eureka," the European program for developing new technologies. The decision in principle to do this was announced 24 June at the 11th Eureka Conference, held in Paris at ministerial level.

The Eureka Program was founded in 1985 on France's initiative by way of a civilian alternative to America's "Star Wars" project. One of the chief motivations for promoting "Eureka" was European concern over the brain drain to the United States, which with its usual gusto launched a recruitment campaign of specialists from the Old World to work on SDI projects.

The idea for Eureka is based on the common philosophy of EC Commission programs—joint financing via the state or private sectors.

In practice, several (at least two) enterprises from the 20 countries participating in Eureka pool efforts to elaborate any kind of scientific-technical project. If that project is deemed innovative, then the firms receive appropriate subsidies under the Eureka policy. According to information from research, Eureka has helped to increase the competitiveness of European firms and promoted the speedy assimilation of new technologies. At present, work is under way on over 800 projects within the program's framework involving no fewer than 4,000 enterprises. Eureka's most famous projects include "Prometheus," aimed at improving motor transport, "Dzhessi" [as transliterated], aimed at elaborating new electronic components, and "Euro-track," for the protection of the environment.

Russia took part in a number of draft programs even before acceding to them officially. Now it will be able to initiate projects itself. What else will participation in Eureka give us?

"Of course, our country will now be able to profit from all the advantages which the other 20 Eureka participants enjoy," Feliks Grishayev, an official of the Russian Federation Ministry of Science and Technical Policy, told your correspondent. "Our country does have ideas of interest to the West, so the Europeans want to work with us. These include, for instance, specific projects in the sphere of laser technology, the development of diagnostic apparatus, oil pipelines, and a program for protecting the environment. Cooperation has already been established with countries such as the FRG, Britain, and France, and there is interest from the Norwegians.

"Apart from assimilating state-of-the-art technologies, participation in Eureka will spawn real economic benefits insofar as our potential partners know the market better. There is every reason to believe that work on Eureka projects will also slow down the brain drain from our country, creating a necessary interest in the future for our scientists."

As noted during the Paris conference, Russia's acceptance as a member of the Eureka project, like the earlier

acceptance of Hungary into the organization, testifies to the desire of program participants actively to develop relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

West Said Not Providing 'Promised' Aid

PM3006110593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jun 93 p 7

[Vladimir Bolshakov report under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "West Deceives Russia Again"]

[Text] Paris—Commenting on the recent report from Russia about the "liberalization" of coal prices, LE FIGARO's economic supplement "fingered," so to speak, the authors of this presidential edict. "Yeltsin's edict," the newspaper writes, "which enters into force 1 July, gladdened Western financial wizards who are following the progress of the Russian reform. But unfortunately they are the only ones who feel happy about this."

Why do the Western-style reforms imposed by [as published] Russia bring happiness to nobody in Russia and please only the West? Why is the West only presenting demands to Russia and not providing the aid promised in exchange for reforms?

Economists who are following the transition of Russia and the other former Soviet republics to a market economy note that the same pattern can be detected in Western countries' "aid" to the Yeltsin regime as in aid earlier to Gorbachev. As soon as a threat to the West's Kremlin proteges arises from the opposition, "cardinal decisions" on multibillion-dollar aid to Russia are adopted in all "Big Seven" capitals. The "democratic" press immediately begins a gigantic campaign to brainwash the Russian population, to make it believe that now "foreign countries are going to help us" (the organizers of these campaigns still regard Ostap Bender's arguments as the most persuasive ones).

Meanwhile, the West, in exchange for promises of future aid but without yet giving Russia a cent, immediately demands a whole series of concessions and reforms from it.

And as soon as Russia begins implementing these disastrous recommendations, the West backtracks and announces that "in view of present economic difficulties" it will be unable to provide the promised aid to Russia.

This pattern is being repeated on the eve of the "Big Seven" summit in Tokyo, to which B.N. Yeltsin has also been invited.

As BUSINESS WEEK has reported, the entire package of planned Western aid to Russia was estimated at somewhere around \$37 billion by 1 May this year, which brought Russia's "democratic" press to a state of total ecstasy.

But what has been the result? For a start the IMF refused to give Moscow the promised money (the first payment) on the pretext that "Moscow has yet to give the IMF guarantees that the money will not be wasted."

It also transpires that the figure of \$37 billion was inflated since it included \$16 billion for the rescheduling of repayment of the USSR's foreign debt. And this means that as a result the sum promised by the "Big Seven" to Gorbachev was reduced accordingly, from \$24 billion to \$21 billion.

The "fund" to "promote privatization" promised Russia ahead of the referendum has also proved to be inflated. Literally a couple of weeks before the meeting of G-7 leaders in Tokyo planned for the beginning of July Japanese Foreign Minister K. Muto "exposed" his colleagues by disclosing that no one is going to allocate \$4 billion to Russia, and if they give anything, it will be no more than \$500 million.

Nor will Russia receive the \$6 billion for the "ruble stabilization" fund which it was promised at that same April conference in Tokyo.

As for President Clinton's promises, it is the same story. We will have to "urgently wait" for the \$1.6 billion which he promised Yeltsin in Vancouver on the night of 3-4 April. First, these dollars were not aid to Russia, but U.S. Government aid to American farmers allocated back in Bush's time and not fully spent. Clinton believed that he was risking nothing in promising to help Yeltsin "as soon as possible" with food and grain. But he failed to take into account the mighty force of U.S. bureaucracy, which is in no hurry at all to help Russia. And the \$1.8 billion in "additional U.S. aid" to Russia which the United States promised at the Tokyo conference in April also still remains only a plan that is making slow headway through various U.S. Congress commissions.

In other words, there is no sign of the money promised to Russia.

Russia Notifies DPRK of Nuclear Waste Sites

LD2906135793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0914 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Nadash-keyevich]

[Text] Pyongyang, 29 Jun—Today the Russian side handed over material to the DPRK on the dumping by the former Soviet Union and Russia of radioactive waste in Far Eastern seas, including the Sea of Japan which washes the shores of the Korean Peninsula. At issue are the precise dumping coordinates and a problem which concerns Korea, the flora and fauna of the adjacent seas. The Sea of Japan is the DPRK's main fishing ground.

The DPRK Foreign Ministry spokesman voiced satisfaction at the constructive approach by Russia on overcoming the aftermath of nuclear dumping and proposed that consultations should be held on this in the near future.

IZVESTIYA Analyzes ICAO Finding on KAL Tragedy

*934Q0107A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 93
First Edition pp 1, 5*

[Article by Andrey Illesh and Aleksandr Shalnev: "The Mystery of the South Korean Boeing-747 Is Solved—To Be Forgotten?"]

[Text] Montreal—Washington—The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) handed over to IZVESTIYA materials from its investigation into the destruction of the South Korean passenger airliner, flight KAL-007, shot down by a Soviet fighter plane in the early morning of 1 September 1983 in the sky over Sakhalin.

How It All Began

Let us remind the reader the main points. In this incident, the 269 passengers and crew members of this largest passenger aircraft perished in the night sky (or the cold waters of the Tatar Strait near Moneron Island where the giant jumbo jet crashed). The world was in an uproar for many years following this incident, trying to find out any, even minute, details of the tragedy. The Soviet Union remained silent. It kept silent, having settled for the nickname given to it by Reagan—the "evil empire." The topic of the destruction of a passenger aircraft by the Soviet PVO [Air Defense Forces] was completely forbidden here, even though in order to find out the truth an investigation needed to be started immediately and publicly. Alas, in those years it was impossible.

Even in the late 1980's this topic remained forbidden for journalists. Still, IZVESTIYA took on this task. We have managed to disprove the mendacious official version advanced by Andropov's leadership, which maintained that the destroyed aircraft in question had been a spy plane, whose debris was never found. Journalists from our newspaper met with tens of witnesses, many of whom had signed an official nondisclosure agreement at the time. Others stayed silent, too, fearing with good reason to say "too much." After all, in addition to the government, both the Army and the KGB had a very serious stake in keeping it secret. The top brass of the then Soviet regime were implicated in this: Andropov, Ustinov, Gromyko... The whole truth was known (and even that not completely, because the lies coming from all the services resembled a multilayer pie) to the marshals—Akhromeyev, now deceased by own hand, as well as Ogarkov and Tretyak, who still refuse to talk.

In the course of its work, IZVESTIYA was able to organize an expedition to the site of the Boeing's crash; take unique photos at the bottom of the Tatar Strait,

where the aircraft's debris still rests; interview members of the search teams, special services personnel, pilots, military men, diplomats... In short, to present such a body of evidence that it permitted us to insist on the main point—an international and official investigation of the tragedy.

We were also able to prove that the "black boxes" from the destroyed aircraft had been raised from the bottom of the sea and kept by the military in strict secrecy. Russian President Boris Yeltsin got personally involved in the mystery of the Korean Boeing and in the end handed the contents of the "boxes" to the interested parties: Americans, Japanese, Koreans, and IZVESTIYA newspaper. Later, by agreement of the four countries, the ICAO took possession of the unique documents and for over half a year conducted its own investigation, bringing in leading specialists and utilizing state-of-the-art electronics.

The ICAO has completed its investigation now and the documents have been published. The newspaper is unable, of course, to publish hundreds of pages of the official report. Therefore, today we offer our readers a brief analysis of the ICAO's voluminous effort.

ICAO Does Not Take Anything for Granted

In preparing the documents for the ICAO, the Russian side turned out most forthcoming. In the report, which finalized the ICAO's effort to investigate the circumstances of the destruction of the South Korean Boeing-747, the documents and materials handed over by Moscow are quoted to a greater extent and more frequently than any others.

On the one hand, one could hardly expect otherwise, since we were the ones who gave the ICAO the "black boxes" which contained the most valuable information on what happened to the Boeing. On the other hand, however, in everything else we ended up being clearly more generous with respect to openness than, for instance, the Japanese and Americans—the indirect, and in some key points direct, participants in the tragedy.

Among the documents handed over by Russia to ICAO expert groups, are the transcripts of all tape recordings made at our PVO command posts on Sakhalin: There were communications on the ground as well as between ground and fighter pilots.

Alas, the Americans gave the ICAO only a fraction of the enormous amount of materials accumulated in the United States.

Yes, this time Russia was not afraid to perhaps look in the worst light in front of the entire world. We showed everything. And now the result: The ICAO has removed officially the accusation against Russia that had been standing all these years, supported first and foremost by the United States when the Reagan administration was

in power there. Namely, the accusation that we consciously shot down a passenger aircraft and thus committed an act of unheard of barbarity.

(In this respect, the Soviet side should get "its due," too, for multiplying the lies daily with the help of all the mass media in response to Reagan's hysterics, and instead of a serious investigation at the time getting busy with something else—burying the facts. For over a month and a half, an enormous armada of ships searched for the "black boxes" amidst the aircraft debris for a purpose far removed from making their contents available to the world. On the contrary—to hide it as deep as possible. After all, immediately after the aircraft's destruction, the monstrous mistake of the Soviet side became obvious—they had shot down not a spy plane but a stray passenger aircraft! In addition, from the mouth of direct participants in the search we learned that nobody—nobody!—was tasked with searching the bottom for human remains in order to commit them to earth. They looked only for electronic devices. The haste with which the army and special services of the former USSR attempted to eliminate the trail tremendously complicated the current international investigation and, in our opinion, to a great extent made it impossible to finally dot all the i's in this tragedy).

From the transcripts—which, by the way, were not accepted by ICAO experts as is, "on faith," but were scrupulously matched with tape recordings and only then accepted as genuine—from these transcripts it follows clearly and unequivocally: In shooting down the Korean Boeing, we were convinced that we were dealing with an American RS-135 spy plane! That during that tragic night there was indeed a spy plane in that area of the Soviet Far East, which the Americans already had acknowledged; in the course of the current investigation, however, they confirmed what Moscow had been trying to prove for a long time: At some point the RS-135 and the Boeing-747 were separated by only 75 miles. Which means that the chance of having them confused was quite real.

Did We Know At Whom We Were Shooting?

Only twice—in almost 200 pages of transcripts of the recordings made at our command posts—does one encounter some semblance of doubt as to whether the transgressor could be a passenger aircraft.

General Kamenskiy, the commander of the Far Eastern Military District Air Force:

"We need to clarify—maybe it is some civilian craft or something, devil knows what."

To which there comes a response from another general:

"What civilian—it has flown over Kamchatka. From the ocean side, without identification. As soon as it violates the state border I issue an order to shoot down..."

This conversation took place 12 minutes before Gen-nadiy Osipovich, the pilot of the Su-15 fighter plane, fired his two missiles at the Boeing.

By then General Kornukov at Sakhalin had received his order to issue the order to shoot. From whom?

Judging by the transcript, from General Tretyak—commander of the Far Eastern Military District.

Twenty minutes after the Su-15 attack the following conversation was recorded at the command post:

"The pilots observed a four-engine... could not identify; flying with navigation lights on."

"A four-engine; big; yes?"

"Yes, big, big, four. We have used weapons, with the permission of the high chief. Ivan Moiseyevich gave a go-ahead. Ivan Moiseyevich gave the order. Tretyak..."

Osipovich carried out the order, although, as can be seen from another passage in the transcript, he "was not able to establish identification. Because it was night. Visually saw only a silhouette. Only a silhouette."

And this is that highly precise, disciplined, dependable, and effective PVO system we have heard so much about?! Probably everyone reading the transcript will be left with the impression of chaos, confusion, even panic that reigned in those hours at Far Eastern command posts. The entire transcript is literally peppered with foul language. Everybody swears—from the highest-ranking generals down to small-fry duty officers, betraying not so much the tension of the moment as the inability to concentrate, to get hold of oneself, to calmly analyze the situation.

One cannot be certain, of course, that Americans, for instance, or someone else could do serious work in a situation where, for example, a duty officer cannot reach a command post in the nearby settlement on the telephone, although he is begging the telephone operator: "...girls, I need to get through now, life or death. It is a matter of state importance, I am not kidding... All right, I will keep on the request, will call you in about 10 minutes, maybe their lines are not operational or something"; or, when summoning his subordinate, a commander yells: "Take transportation or run, I do not know how, just get here right away"; or when a general badgers: "I will put you in a f... guardhouse. Why are you not answering the phone?" And hears a reply: "Comrade general, all lines are busy here," and the general, becoming even more agitated, yells, "...what kind of nonsense is this?" while another general presses on, "...stop this circus at the command post; what is that noise out there? I repeat the combat task: Use missile weaponry and destroy target 60-65..."

After the Soviet Fighter's Attack the Boeing Began To Climb

Osipovich fired two missiles at the Boeing. He believed—and said in an IZVESTIYA interview—that one of them wiped off half of the left wing. The analysis of the “black box” recordings led ICAO experts to conclusions that were in a certain sense sensational. Among these conclusions is this: Osipovich’s statement is mistaken, because more than a minute after the attack the KAL-007 continued to send radio signals using high-frequency transmitter No. 1, whose antenna is located at the tip of the left wing.

Other conclusions are sensational as well: Contrary to earlier assumptions, probably none of the Boeing’s four engines were damaged. The flight engineer of the damaged aircraft remarked twice—and this can be heard on the tape recording of one of the “black boxes”—that the engines are functioning normally.

Moreover, the KAL-007 did not go into a freefall immediately after the attack, as some specialists had maintained, but... began to climb and in 40 seconds gained more than a kilometer in altitude—from 35,000 feet to 38,250 feet. Only then did the Boeing begin a descent; again, not falling, but essentially gliding, although increasingly faster, in a spiral. The last time the KAL-007 was registered on the radars was nine minutes after it had been hit by the Su-15. At an altitude of 5,000 meters. Then the radar contact was lost.

By then both “black boxes” had stopped functioning. Why? The ICAO experts were unable to answer this question, but noted: At that point—on the 104th second after the attack—the Boeing was at an altitude of 33,850 feet, had an air speed of 282 knots, and a vertical rate of descent of about 5,000 feet a minute. By the way, the rate of descent slowed down substantially: In the beginning, after the Boeing, having climbed up, began to fall, it was 12,000 feet a minute. Such a sharp drop in the rate of descent could indicate that the damaged aircraft was to a certain extent under the control of the pilots, who apparently until the last moment kept trying to resolve the emergency situation and land the aircraft.

The Horrible Mystery of the Passengers' Disappearance

So, the Boeing was still intact for at least nine minutes—perhaps even 12, considering the time it took to fall from the altitude of 5,000 meters where the contact with it was lost. During these nine minutes most, if not all, passengers certainly complied with the orders usually given by the crew in emergency situations: buckled their seat belts and put on oxygen masks. But here is the greatest mystery that defied even the ICAO experts: Where are the passengers’ remains? Not a single body was found in the Sakhalin tragedy. Not one!

Judging by the ICAO report, the experts who conducted the investigation, alas, did not pay special attention to the question of remains. The report mentions the subject only once—referring to our divers who found the bulk of

the Boeing debris on the ocean floor almost a month later and who reported that they did not see any bodies. And we have no reason not to trust the word of these courageous people who had spent more than 20 days at the bottom of the sea, at the depth of about 300 meters.

A month later there probably was indeed not much that could be found. But literally shortly after the catastrophe our ships started to converge on the Boeing crash site in order to conduct search operations. Could it be that then, too, not a single body was found? This remains the main unsolved mystery...

Other Fighter Planes Were Following Osipovich

Let us return to the command posts. Osipovich fired two missiles. Most likely, only one hit the target, and apparently it was not the one armed with a heat-seeking guidance system—otherwise, at least one of the four engines would have been hit. As the ICAO report notes, the second missile had a proximity fuse and was supposed to go off about 50 meters from the target. It probably did explode exactly this way, damaging first and foremost the aircraft’s control system.

Osipovich could not know what damage had been done to the Boeing—he only saw the flashes of exploding missiles. Nevertheless, the Su-15 pilot reported to the command post: “Target is destroyed!”

Osipovich was not alone in the airspace; there were other fighter planes there. They were the ones to communicate to the command post that the transgressor aircraft was still flying, which caused a stormy and angry reaction.

Let us read the transcripts:

“Titovnin, what is happening?”

“Nothing so far.”

“What is the matter? It was locked on; why has it not been shot down?..

“...Titovnin, how is it, start talking. Have you lost the target?”

“We have lost the target, Comrade Colonel, in the Moneron area... After the launch the target turned to the right over Moneron...”

“This means that again, from what you are saying, it violated the border, has it not?”

“Well, it is in the Moneron area, so it is, of course, over our territory.”

“Finish it off, finish it off. Bring the MiG-23 closer.”

“Understood, the MiG-23 is in this area... The order is given: Upon locating the target destroy it...”

And another passage. Another commander—with different subordinates:

“The target is turning to the right, Comrade General.”

"I do not understand the result. Why is the target flying? Missiles have been fired, and the target is flying, f... What is it? Give an order to the navigator, have you all become mute there?"

"But, Comrade General, the order was given to the chief of staff, the chief of staff gave an order to the navigator, and the navigator gives an order to..."

"How long can this information be in transit? Can I not ask the result of the missile attack? Where, what—did you not understand?..."

"You are carrying out orders like a slowpoke, f.... He is flying without a fuel tank, he can maintain any speed, f..., to destroy the target."

Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak's order must be carried out no matter what. God forbid, maybe Osipovich did not do it right. Finish it off, finish it off...

The cloud cover in the Sakhalin area was very thick and low that night, and in those very moments, as the general demanded to "finish it off," the KAL-007, invisible to both fighter planes and radars, was only seconds away from the formidable firmament of the ocean.

According to a former air defense general, the sky over Sakhalin the night of 31 August to 1 September was "all crowded." At the district headquarters order, the main pair led by Lieutenant Colonel Osipovich rose into the sky to intercept the target; then a backup pair, as well as several other aircraft. All in all, 10 combat aircraft were sent to destroy the South Korean airliner: four MiG-21's from Sovetskaya Gavan, two MiG-23's from the airfield 280 km outside of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, and four Su-15's from the Sokol settlement. The pilot who had shot down the Boeing said the same to our correspondent Nikolay Burbyga:

"That something out of the ordinary was happening in the sky I could guess from the radio communications between the airborne pilots and the ground. The airwaves were virtually littered with the remarks of the pilots following behind me," recalled Gennadiy Osipovich. "Someone was chirping into the airwaves that he was seeing an air combat. Apparently, he could see my missiles that caught up with the Boeing. Later, on the ground, I learned that after me, other aircraft took off, both from mine and the neighboring airfield..."

...All of this could have been avoided if the generals had not been so protective of their shoulder boards and had stopped continuously pestering the fighter pilots with orders to "not let the transgressor slip away." Had Osipovich been able to do what international norms required and what had been entirely precluded by the Soviet PVO. Had the hundreds of specialists (as early as on Kamchatka!) figured out who it was that had entered our air space... And finally, had the operators of Japanese and American radars followed the instructions. Then the tragedy might not have happened.

The ICAO Report: the "Conclusions" Part

3.12. The KAL-007 flight crew did not carry out prescribed navigational procedures which ensure that the aircraft maintains the programmed course over the entire length of the flight.

3.19. According to data from U.S. representatives, the military radar posts in Alaska were not aware in real time that the aircraft was moving in a westerly direction with an increasing deviation to the north (that is, it was learned later, when the radar recordings were analyzed and the KAL-007 no longer existed. Meanwhile—and the report reminds of this once again—current regulations required that any aircraft "become an object of interception by the U.S. air defense forces" if it entered without special permission the identification zone of American air defenses. The KAL-007 entered this zone and went through it unimpeded. Why?—Author).

3.32. The USSR PVO command had reached the conclusion that the KAL-007 was a U.S. intelligence aircraft RS-135 before it gave an order to destroy it.

3.33. Military radar posts of the Japanese Defense Agency had information that some aircraft was heading for the USSR airspace over Sakhalin Island. According to the Japanese side, they did not know it was a civilian aircraft that had veered off its route. (Why did they not attempt to find out? During that segment of the route, it was the Japanese the KAL-007 crew maintained contact with—not the military operators, though, but rather civilian ones.—Author).

...So why, after all, did KAL-007, whose crew, according to the ICAO report, did not know until the last moment that they had veered off course, that they had entered Soviet airspace, and that Soviet fighters were chasing the aircraft, end up where it was not supposed to be? To this question, ICAO experts offer strictly guesswork: Apparently the Boeing crew, which over the preceding several weeks had to fly a lot on an intensive schedule, crossing time zones with a tremendous time lag several times, had their attention span, concentration, and ability to adequately evaluate the situation weakened. Routine operations—such as verification of the data from various instruments "holding" the course—did not seem of much need to them. The crew relied entirely on the autopilot, which was turned on as soon as the KAL-007 took off from Anchorage, and was turned off only five hours later, when the aircraft had already been hit by Osipovich.

Ten Years After the Tragedy

On 1 September it will be 10 years since the Sakhalin tragedy. As we know from the leadership of the special government commission set up in Russia after President Yeltsin officially presented to the world public the contents of the "black boxes," associations of the KAL-007 victims from Japan, United States, and Korea have been invited to spend the days of the tragic jubilee in the city of Nevelsk, located only a few tens of kilometers from

the Boeing crash site—the city where a memorial dedicated to the incident's victims will be erected.

Our restless world is full of other tragedies; they happen almost every day. And the Sakhalin story seems to be fading more and more into the past. Politicians have new concerns. But the people who will come to Sakhalin the end of August want only one thing today—to drop the wreaths not merely into the sea but at the graves of their loved ones. And to learn the truth, no matter how horrible it might be, about the fate of 269 people who disappeared. The IZVESTIYA investigation has not been able to give a complete answer to this question. Neither could the ICAO.

Who can?

Yastrzhembskiy Defends Arms Deal With India

LD2906142193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1357 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Smelyakov and Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—"Russia is interested in non-proliferation of nuclear arms and missile technology more than other nuclear club members. We understand the U.S. concern over a Russian-Indian deal on Russia's delivery of cryogenic engines, but we think this concern is excessive," head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's Information and Press Department Sergey Yastrzhembskiy told a briefing here today.

In his words, Russia has repeatedly offered to hold an international examination of the deal, as, in its opinion, the latter corresponds to the strict parameters of non-proliferation of missile technology for military uses. The U.S. side has a different point of view.

Thus, a way out should be found to take into account interests of both sides and avoid their infringement, said Sergey Yastrzhembskiy. "We favor the soonest solution to the problem," he added.

Asked about the postponement of a U.S. visit of Russian Government head Viktor Chernomyrdin, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy said there is no specific date of Chernomyrdin's U.S. visit. However, Moscow and Washington proceed from the fact it will, certainly, be done.

The visit is very important as it concerns space, power engineering and oil extraction. All the issues will be put as a key package on the agenda of the Russian premier's visit to America.

"However, the visit should be prepared in such a way to receive maximum results, including the settlement of Russia's sales of cryogenic engines to India," stressed Sergey Yastrzhembskiy.

'Compromise' Urged on Deal

PM2906082393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Jun 93 First Edition p 4

[Boris Konovalov article: "End of 'Cold War' Has Not Paved Russia's Way to Space Services Market"]

[Text] An advance group headed by Vice Premier A. Shokhin flew out to the United States ahead of Russian Head of Government V. Chernomyrdin's visit there. One of the group's tasks is to discuss questions concerning Russia's admission to the world market in commercial launches. The situation is very difficult.

So far all mechanisms have been set in train to prevent Russia from entering this market, which has already been operating for over 15 years. At the same time it is clear that, given the ending of the Cold War, a major space power's claims to the right to make commercial launches cannot be discounted. But even without Russia this market is crowded. The Europeans have a 60-65-percent share and the Americans a 30-percent share. They have to jockey for position, since the supply of launch services is 2.5 times greater than consumer demand even without Russia.

The United States has control of a powerful lever for regulating this market. Over 60 percent of payloads, including those for Asian, African, and Latin America countries, are carried by U.S. firms. For a communications satellite to land in Russia or Kazakhstan, for instance, under currently existing laws a U.S. export license must be obtained. This problem cannot be solved without political agreement. To date we have signed our one and only contract, for the launch of the INMAR-SAT-3 international satellite, only last year. And this happened only after a joint political statement by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin supporting this project.

But the United States has now taken a very hard-line stance, linking Russia's admission to the space services market to its joining the agreement on the nonproliferation of rocket technology. The "acid test" was the contract signed by the USSR Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Development and Use of Space Technology for the National Economy and Scientific Research] and the Indian Space Research Organization on cooperation in constructing a cryogenic hydrogen stage for India's national launcher.

Indeed, formally the agreement on the nonproliferation of rocket technology, to which Russia still does not belong, draws no distinction between peaceful rocket boosters for space vehicles and live missiles. The sole criterion is that everything belonging to the category of rockets capable of carrying a load of over 500 kg for a distance of over 300 km is considered dangerous. The United States views the Indian contract from this perspective. And, while not objecting now to the delivery of materiel, the United States views the transfer of technological documentation and some equipment and rigging as a potentially dangerous situation. The Americans

claim that with some modernization all this could be used to produce live missiles.

Specialists realize that it is in fact practically inconceivable to use cryogenic stages with very complex fuel technology for military purposes. Nevertheless, relying on purely formal indications, the United States is already applying sanctions to Glavkosmos and is threatening to extend them to a number of Russian space enterprises. All contacts between the United States and Indian space organizations, which before that were extremely comprehensive and benevolent, have been banned for two years now.

Russia is having to combat this hard-line approach in very difficult economic conditions. In a conversation with me Yu. Koptev, general director of the Russian Space Agency, said that many space sector enterprises are now on the verge of closure. In the first quarter of this year the average wage in the space sector was only 13,000 rubles [R] a month. At the same time the average in the machine building sector was much higher—R21,000. The government's latest decision to cut budget sectors' appropriations by 20 percent will greatly affect the rocket and space industry.

"In these conditions," Yuriy Nikolayevich says, "we are very interested in all sources of nonbudgetary appropriations. The stakes are now on wide-ranging cooperation with Europe and the United States. Documents on granting Russia 12 commercial rocket launches in the period from 1996 through 2000 have been prepared with the EC. The Russian Space Agency and NASA have agreed on possible areas for utilizing our technologies and production capacities for a version of the future "Freedom" station. The utilization of Soyuz ships as rescue ships could become a reality. With the aid of Russian rockets individual elements of the Freedom station could be put into orbit and our docking, temperature regulation, and life-support systems could be utilized. A more extensive project to construct a joint station is being discussed. This cooperation could bring our space sector a minimum of \$500-600 million, while the maximum estimates are in excess of \$1.5 billion...

Yes, of course, such cooperation would substantially ease the burden of the economic crisis for our Russian space enterprises. Compared with this, the benefits of space cooperation with India look much more modest. The currently existing space contract with India is worth \$120 million. True, it could be followed by a second contract for the creating the entire infrastructure and backup for launching cryogenic stages. This will total around \$300 million.

But a comparison of the benefits of cooperation between the United States and India must not be approached purely from the viewpoint of simple arithmetic. India is our long-standing partner in the scientific and technical and military spheres. Breaking the space contract will hit this partnership badly. Furthermore, to a certain extent India is a Third World leader and its voice is heeded here. Breaking the contract will undoubtedly be viewed as

weakness on Russia's part, as yielding to pressure from the imperialist superpower. We will get a name as an unreliable, unpredictable partner too dependent on U.S. "favor." This will undermine Russia's position in all world markets—which it cannot afford.

The only way out of the situation that has arisen is to seek a compromise, to hold trilateral talks, with India's participation essential. Firm guarantees from that country's leadership that everything obtained from the Russian-Indian contract will be used only for peaceful space purposes could serve as the basis of a compromise.

Possible Reshuffle in Foreign Ministry Viewed

MK2506101493 Moscow MOSKOVSKIY
KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 25 Jun 93 p 1

[Mikhail Gurevich report: "Boomerang for Deputy Minister. The Wheel of History Rolls Back at Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS has learned from sources close to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs collegium that Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze, it seems, will set off soon for Australia as ambassador. Vitaliy Churkin, another deputy minister, will set off for Belgium, while Valeriy Kinyaykin, Foreign Ministry personnel chief, is slated to be ambassador to Italy to the great chagrin (to put it mildly) of Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, head of the Supreme Soviet international affairs committee, who for several months has been regarded as a de facto ambassador. Oversight of Foreign Ministry personnel and educational establishments will apparently be transferred from Kunadze to Boris Pastukhov, who is in charge of finances, the economic activity of the ministry, and of problems in the Caucasus.

While Churkin's relocation is due to the general failure of the entire world community policy line in the former Yugoslavia, they hide no malicious joy in blaming Georgiy Kunadze for the flop of the "Japan sector" (Yeltsin's constantly postponed visit), a too "generous" policy in regard to Kuril Islands, his constant frictions with the other deputy ministers, and the failed attempt to track down the thieves in the Diplomatic Academy. Serves you right, they gloat: Instead of the very same Japan, you get the "nonprestigious" southern hemisphere, where during the years of stagnation assistants to general secretaries were traditionally sent for their transgressions.

Much as MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS expected, the commission created by the decision of a special Foreign Ministry collegium has so far turned up no facts of commercial abuses or other criminal practices in the Diplomatic Academy.

Well, what does the Foreign Ministry say? MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS could talk only with Georgiy Chernovol, who stated that the official inquiry was not over yet and that no special crime was discovered. To the MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS query: "How about any 'non-special' crime?"—the Foreign Ministry deputy personnel chief said that he was not authorized to give interviews.

Constitution Issues

Next Conference Session Set for 12 Jul

LD2906134593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1034 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun—The next plenary session of the Constitutional Conference is to be held 12 July. An ITAR-TASS correspondent learned this today from Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy prime minister of the Russian Federation government and coordinator of the working group of commodity producers and entrepreneurs at the Constitutional Conference.

In the meantime, during the interval in the meetings of the working groups of the conference, the commission which is finishing off the constitutional draft is continuing to find agreement on controversial statements such as rights of components of the Russian Federation and the status of bodies of federal authority and of local self-government.

The 26 June plenary session revealed differences of opinion about the form of Russia's state structure, namely whether it should be a presidential or parliamentary republic. The conceptual disagreement with republics, including Tatarstan, also is to be settled: it is to be defined whether Russia will remain a federation in the strict sense of this word, or whether relations with some Russian Federation components will be built on the basis of a treaty (a confederation).

Yeltsin Team Seen To Make 'Tactical Error'

PM2906120793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 93 First Edition p 4

[Sergey Chugayev report: "Prolongation of Constitutional Process Could Lead to Government's Resignation"]

[Text] The results of the latest plenary session of the Constitutional Conference, held 26 June, cannot be called unexpected. Even before the start of the conference's work many observers had foreseen the national-territorial contradictions which have become the main stumbling block. It is impossible in principle to resolve these contradictions today exclusively by legislative means, however hard the best jurists on the presidential team might try. The 26 June conference results seem to have proved this very convincingly.

The paradox of the situation can be seen in the fact that today it obviously is not worth tackling the resolution of these objectively insoluble problems. Only time and the life of the republics and regions under conditions of normal economic relations will be capable of putting everything in its place in all fairness. A constitutional law, the idea of adopting which has hung in the air at the Constitutional Conference but has not yet been actually

implemented, will be able to create these necessary normal economic conditions.

Meanwhile, it is hard to rid yourself of the impression that, by gambling on drawing up and adopting in full the text of the new constitution, the president's team has made a tactical error which has caused it to lose momentum.

An analysis of the internal political situation in Russia today gives grounds for concluding that the government will once again be the chief target of the struggle in the next few weeks.

Having failed with the accelerated adoption of the draft of the new constitution and having not yet submitted even the main theses of their economic policy, the president and his supporters still do not have grounds for demanding that the Congress be convened this summer. To date there has been no sign that B. Yeltsin and his team intend to make effective use of the results of the answer to the second question in the referendum.

It should be recognized that the parliamentary opposition has changed its tactic quite effectively in the struggle against the executive. The first trial balloons, launched by A. Rutskoy before the referendum and by Deputy General Prosecutor N. Makarov last week, are proof of this. It has to be believed that these were precisely trial balloons. According to available information, it is perfectly realistic to expect the main blow during the next two weeks, which will most likely be struck by General Prosecutor V. Stepankov personally. This will probably be a more impressive batch of compromising material, which will persuade wavering deputies to express no confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers. Thus, the opposition will be able quite elegantly, by appearing in the role of anticorruption fighters, to eliminate the *carte blanche* given to the president in the referendum to implement his socioeconomic policy.

It is perfectly obvious that after such a demarche by parliament the president will be forced to proclaim the present government an acting government for three months—which will render the prospect of convening the Congress in the summer totally unrealistic. This is what R. Khasbulatov is actively seeking, because, in addition to dreaming of gaining control of the government (he can quite realistically achieve this goal at the fall Congress), he is also really afraid, to judge from information coming in from many sources, that a summer Congress could prove to be the last at which he will be sitting in the speaker's chair.

The fate of Khasbulatov—who is constantly threatened by the uniting of communists, centrists, and democrats against him—the fate of the government, and, in the final analysis, the prospects for political stabilization in Russia depend almost entirely today on the votes of 20-30 deputies who have sided neither with the centrists who have gone over to opposition to the speaker nor with representatives of the National Salvation Front who support Khasbulatov. It has to be thought that the main

backstage "work" on both the president's and the speaker's part is developing today around precisely these legislators. In the final analysis, it is their votes which will play the decisive role when this question is raised in parliament: either to make the government resign or to call the Supreme Soviet chairman to account for the political course which he imposed on parliament and on which (the political course, not parliament) the voters passed a vote of no confidence in the referendum. As is known, legislators' signatures are already being collected for an appeal to make the speaker resign. Only the Congress can adopt the final decision, however.

This is also why the president and his supporters see the convening of the Congress in the summer and the submission to it of a draft constitutional law and economic program as almost the only chance of channeling the present political process in at least a relatively controllable direction. The deputies must also be objectively interested in such an outcome. For otherwise, if parliament continues implementing its aggressive tactic—if it expresses no confidence in the government and finally wrecks the constitutional process—the president will be left with no choice but to remove this Congress. By any means—by wrecking the quorum with the help of his supporters, ignoring its decisions, seeking support increasingly actively among the components of the Federation.... Whichever of these methods is chosen, however, it is obvious that it will in no way promote the stabilization of the internal political and internal economic situation in the country.

Oblasts, Krays Vie for Status With Republics

PM2906160193 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 93 p 3

[Dmitriy Babich article: "How Many Republics Will There Be in Russia?"]

[Text] Nobody can now predict what the political map of Russia will look like in six months' time. The Constitutional Conference, as we forecast, has been unable to meet all the demands of the Federation components.

The latest confirmation of this was the statement by Tatarstan President Mintimer Shaymiyev and Speaker Farid Mukhametshin recalling the republic's representatives from the Constitutional Conference. The conference has been unable to meet the republic's main demand—the inclusion in the Constitution of a separate treaty between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Tatarstan on the special relationship between them.

Meanwhile the oblasts are continuing to demand that they be given equal rights with the republics. Some of them are planning to actually declare themselves equal. Irkutsk Oblast has proposed that it merge with Krasnoyarsk Kray to form an East Siberian Republic. In early July a session of Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet will also be examining the question of setting up a republic on the oblast's territory. Arkhangelsk is talking about setting up a Pomorye Republic [Pomorskaya respublika—refers to

coastal regions of White and Barents Seas settled by Russians from 12th century on], and Rostov is making similar noises about a Don Republic.

We should not mock these plans—they are more than serious. In today's Russia each "titular" ethnic group has acquired its own statehood—apart from the Russians themselves, whose rights have been seriously infringed upon. Now the "Russian" oblasts are making up for lost time.

Actually, "sovereignization" is just one manifestation of "privatization," or, rather, of the fierce struggle for ownership which grips all of what used to be Soviet society. After all, being a sovereign republic means being entitled to dispose of diamonds, oil, and real estate—in short, everything of any value that is left in Russia. Which local authorities would not themselves want to set taxes, privatize property, and trade with the West?

The only trouble is that, in taking their piece of the cake, none of the "republics" has given any thought as to whether they will be able to make use of it. That is why the kray and oblast representatives who gathered for the conference at Moscow Oblast Soviet yesterday opposed recognizing the republics as sovereign states. This is now the only hope of preventing the collapse of Russia. There are currently more oblasts and krays than there are republics—67 as against 21. Only time will tell who will win.

More on Regional Officials' Conference

PM2906132393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in
Russian 29 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[V. Petrovskiy report under "Choosing a Constitution—Choosing a Future" rubric: "Behind the Back of the Representative Power"]

[Text] Chairmen of Russian Federation oblast and kray soviets gathered at Moscow Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies 25 June. "We have gathered here because we are alarmed at the course of the Constitutional Conference," Vyacheslav Aleksandrovich Novikov, chairman of Krasnoyarsk Kray Soviet and also chairman of the Association of Chairmen of Russian Federation Soviets, who presided at the meeting, said. "If it results in a draft which will only enshrine the existing discrimination against krays and oblasts, and if the krays and oblasts do not receive the same management [khozyaystvennyye] rights as the republics, then the division of people into first- and second-class citizens, which we have always had, will be retained."

Concern was apparent in the chairmen's speeches. Their main theme was that the constitutional process is in fact being conducted behind the back of the representative power. We have been unable to seize the initiative, and the Supreme Soviet is poor at coordinating our actions.

Particular note was made both of the inequality of the components of the Federation and of the need to pool efforts aimed at strengthening statehood.

"The republics were able to unite," A. Sychev, chairman of Novosibirsk Oblast Soviet, said, "and it is now time for us, the krays and oblasts, to sit down together and work out our common position."

Official Accuses Yeltsin of 'Blackmail'

PM2906154693 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Oleg Korolev, chairman of Lipetsk Oblast Soviet, by Viktor Petrovskiy; place and date not given: "This Path Leads to a Coup"]

[Text] Oleg Korolev, chairman of Lipetsk Oblast Soviet:

It is too soon to talk about the results of the Constitutional Conference. It all ended with a 12-minute plenary session and a vote on the statement. And no one has seen any serious work yet. The conference organizers essentially still do not know what they want, but clearly they are seeking some different ways of adopting a new constitution, aside from constitutional ways.

The conference standing orders were such that the actual components of the Federation and the leaders of representative organs of power, elected by the people, participated in the vote on a par with representatives of parties and movements and everyone else. This is ludicrous, and I do not think this kind of thing would happen even in Burkina Faso. The plenary sessions were conducted at an absolutely frantic pace, also unparalleled elsewhere, even in our country. Representatives of soviets hardly had a chance to address them.

As far as I could see the only tactics were those of diktat and intimidation. Do you think the fifth version, which the president talked so much and so mysteriously about, is something that actually exists? Nothing of the sort. It is his usual tactics of intimidation and blackmail and indoctrination of those who are susceptible to these methods. The nonconstitutional path is the path to a coup d'etat. It is not on. The members of the Federation have demonstrated their strength. They will rebuff any unconstitutional decision. The only acceptable path is that of the initialing of the draft by the components of the Federation, then by the Supreme Soviet and the Congress. There is no alternative.

Now take a look at this conference from the outside: Mountains of pressing problems everywhere—economic and political—demanding urgent, immediate intervention. A coup in Azerbaijan, a grim political crisis in Ukraine, a fragmenting Russian economy. Meanwhile the members of the government sit in the Marble Hall as if nothing is happening! Even Chernomyrdin, head of the government, is there too. It beats me. Naturally, one

wonders whether this entire spectacle was intended as a smokescreen for the appalling things that are going on in the country.

Ambartsumov Welcomes 'Constructive' Conference Work

PM2806132593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under "Politics" rubric citing Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations; place and date not given: "Not Exacerbate the Confrontation but Get Down to Cooperating With the President"]

[Text] I do not believe that the recall of the Supreme Soviet's official representative is going to influence the constitutional conference's work. There are very many deputies taking part in the conference, and not just members of the Constitutional Commission. The work being done is constructive, deputies are making their own suggestions, and some elements of bias in the presidential draft are being eliminated as a result.

There is a variety of opinions concerning the result of the Constitutional Conference. I think that it could go the route of drawing up an election law, a constitutional law for a transitional period. That is the more conciliatory outcome. But I do not rule out the possibility that a totally new constitution could be prepared for adoption, taking into account to a very large, albeit not equal extent both the presidential draft and the constitutional commission draft.

We have to approach the Constitutional Conference bearing in mind that the president won a vote of confidence in the referendum, that he was relegitimized—elected for a second time, as it were—and it is in that capacity, I believe, that he will continue his work. The Supreme Soviet ought not to exacerbate the confrontation but should get down to cooperating with the president.

Conference Harmony Said 'Propaganda Myth'

PM2906134393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 2

[Viktor Trushkov report: "A Dish Cannot Be Both Hot and Raw. Participants in Latest Plenary Session of Constitutional Conference Draw This Conclusion and Go Off To Finish Cooking Draft"]

[Text] How perspicacious Boris Nikolayevich is! He knows for sure that, if there is no one on the rostrum, there is no problem. That was why he did not allow any debate at the Constitutional Conference's previous plenary sessions. But on 26 June, 14 speakers forced him to give them the floor. And right away there were heaps of problems—despite the rigorous selection of both the speakers and their texts.

Imagine an actor coming on stage during a performance and immediately telling the director that he is going to read a different text. What nonsense! But that was what happened in the Kremlin 26 June. Once given the floor, A. Voronin, a member of the board of Russian cities, began by saying: "Our group has found itself in a tricky situation... We have indeed prepared a statement on behalf of the group regarding the draft constitution. But today, regrettably, after receiving the printed version, we were forced to slightly change the speech." And it turned out that his spontaneous activity was critical in tone: On studying the finalized draft the cities' representatives discovered a "tendency... to ignore existing self-government." He was even ashamed to mention local soviets.

Another participant in the performance—Russian Federation People's Deputy B. Zolotukhin—did not turn up for the performance at all. He may have been obeying the Supreme Soviet's recent decision to boycott the Constitutional Conference as long as V. Shumeyko and M. Poltoranin are sitting there. The president reacted in formidable fashion: "Let us find out what is going on here!"

Someone else could not refrain from inquiring about the president's reaction to the Supreme Soviet's decision at this point. But he only had to utter Shumeyko's name for the microphone to be disconnected.

The session revealed more than just the players' disobedience, however. Some speakers proved too frank—they gave away something that the president's propaganda machine had earnestly hidden from outside view. Thus, Nizhniy Novgorod Deputy Yu. Ryzhov (the one who was very afraid that he was being mixed up with the well-known person of the same name—the academician and diplomat) explained, for instance, that the system of power craved by the "democrats" "should be sound, simple, even somewhat crude." Yu. Chernichenko, the well-known urban peasant, explained the meaning of a "sound, crude" democratic power: "The new constitution's main difference is that it is the constitution of the private owner in Russia." Not the constitution of the state and citizens but only the nouveaux riches—that is all. How do you like that? V. Zhirinovskiy, who fitted in with the group brilliantly, explained: "The constitution is not a candy, it will not be sweet... It is a State Automobile Inspectorate inspector; everyone hates him, but he must be respected."

During the plenary session it became clear that the constitution being palmed off on Russia will not only not be to everyone's liking, but also proposes useless "ground rules" [pravila dvizheniya]. They are contested even by the speakers specially selected by the presidential team. For instance, M. Baglay was astounded that the reference to a "social state" had disappeared from the draft during the finalization process.

M. Masarskiy tried to persuade people to preserve citizens' right to work in hygienic, secure conditions, their

right to an annual vacation and to a minimum wage. It looks as though without guarantees even high-sounding rights are threatened with being expunged as... antimarket. N. Shmelev drew attention to the fact that there are "major gaps" in the text of the draft; there is not even a norm saying who is given the right to declare war and conclude peace. V. Mushinskiy cast doubt on the document's idea regarding the state sovereignty of republics within the Russian Federation. He did not dispute the fact that some people consider this the optimum wording, but he doubted that it is optimistic since he saw it as a threat to Russia's unity.

M. Salye does not understand what kind of government there will be if its head is appointed by parliament and its ministers by the president. A quite reasonable question. Admittedly, a prominent "democrat" proposes seeking the answer in something far removed from democracy—absolute power for the president. Incidentally, B. Yeltsin did not begrudge giving the floor to those speakers who defended the president's monarchic functions. For the same reason he did not ignore "opponentist" V. Zhirinovskiy.

By and large it became clear that, first, the harmonious working of the conference is just a propaganda myth and, second, there is no serious, high-quality draft constitution, contrary to all the assurances. Moreover, the clashes (in particular between the center and the components of the Federation) are so great that there is no sign yet of an end to the constitutional race under the president's command. Admittedly, M. Masarskiy uttered the following reassuring words: "You do of course get the impression that the text is something of a compilation. But a dish cannot be both hot and raw, and this text is hot."

To be precise, hot and politicized through and through. Its authors are concerned not about the future of the country but about how to keep a more secure hold on their positions in power amid growing popular discontent. That is why G. Popov, for instance, proposes expediting new parliamentary elections. So as to ensure that the deputies (or at least half of them) are appointed by the capital's political bosses: "If there are no elections on party lists, once again... some party leaders will be left outside the parliament." And, I suppose, the chairman of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms, like many other "democratic" leaders, has some cause for concern here.

In his hurry to close the session and prevent people speaking from the microphones, B. Yeltsin nonetheless acknowledged that "there are a number of fundamental problems in the draft constitution." But, had there been no speakers, it might have been claimed that there are no problems either.

Progress Toward Composite Constitution Viewed

PM3006074793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in
Russian 29 Jun 93 p 1

[Lyubov Tsukanova article: "The Constitution: The Hidden Reefs Emerge"]

[Text] Despite the widespread skepticism in society and even among the participants in the Constitutional Conference, by the 26 June plenary session the working group had managed to produce a composite draft of the new Basic Law. Presenting it, Boris Yeltsin said that this version is substantially different from both initial drafts—the president's and the Congress'. Let us note that the so-called Constitutional Arbitration Commission, consisting of well-known lawyers under the chairmanship of Academician Kudryavtsev, took part in the coordination of amendments in the final stage. Characterizing the single draft at the present stage, Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, leader of a section, noted that essentially only three articles of the president's draft remained unaltered in it; in other words, this can be called the "Constitutional Conference's draft."

Let us note just a few of the fundamental provisions of what is essentially a new draft. First and foremost there is a new chapter—the Fundamentals of the Constitutional System—introduced on the proposal of a group of components of the Federation. This chapter defines the unshakable principles of the Constitution with which all the remaining constitutional norms must be coordinated. These are a republic form of rule, federalism, the separation of powers, the priority of human rights, the unity and indivisibility of the state, the equality of all forms of ownership, and a multiparty system. The paramountcy of the Russian Federation Constitution throughout the territory of the state is recognized.

Significant amendments have been made to other chapters of the Basic Law. Those provisions relating to the powers of the branches of state power have undergone the greatest change. Let us note in particular that the thesis of the president as arbiter in disputes between the branches of power has been excluded as being the most contentious; the president's term of office has been reduced to four years; guarantees of the legality of the impeachment procedure have been included; and the powers of the chambers of the Federal Assembly have been defined more clearly. In elaborating the mechanism for the separation of powers, the working group proceeded from the principle that no one can be a judge in his own case. If you raise a problem you cannot decide it. Correspondingly, the one who decides a case must not be an interested party. In keeping with the will of the majority, the institution of the Superior Judicial Office has been deleted and the powers of the Constitutional Court have been expanded accordingly.

The discussion revealed quite a few criticisms of the single draft, although the majority of them are individual in character. The number of acute problems was not all

that great, but their gravity gives the working group some fairly strenuous work to do because these are questions of principle.

The first question which could seriously complicate the process of initialing and adopting the draft is the status of the components of the Federation. The republics within Russia are defined as sovereign states, the remaining components are defined as state-territorial formations. Their equality of rights in mutual relations with the federal organs of power is defined. This formula was elaborated by Shakhray's group, and A. Yakovlev called it a "formula for social consensus." However, it is already clear now that there are criticisms of the concept of "sovereignty" as legally imprecise (N. Shmelev), and doubts have been expressed about the feasibility of the equality of rights given the existence of different status (in particular, V. Novikov, chairman of the Krasnoyarsk Kray Soviet, proposed that the questionable definitions should be replaced in the Constitution by an exhaustive list of additional rights of the republics, such as: language, right of citizenship, own constitution and attributes of state power, and so forth).

The question of the character of the Federation remains unresolved in practice: Should it be constitutional, contractual, or constitutional-contractual (the republics are insisting on the latter). V. Novikov again asked this reasonable question: If a republic removes its signature from the treaty what happens to the principle of the unity and indivisibility of Russia? M. Masarskiy, spokesman of the group of commodity producers and entrepreneurs, recalled that the "state did not emerge on the basis of a treaty, it is a thousand years old" and it makes sense to speak of a constitutional federation. It is clear that this question, which is one of the most acute, will be a stumbling block to initialing the draft if it comes to that.

Another contentious problem is the form of rule. The participants in the discussion noted that in fact in the present draft there is a significant tendency toward a parliamentary republic because the president has ceased to be the head of the executive, the right to appoint the prime minister belongs to the parliament, and it resolves the question of the dismissal of the government, but the president in turn has the right to dissolve parliament. In the opinion of Marina Salye, leader of the Free Democratic Party of Russia, the Constitutional Conference is missing an opportunity to enshrine in the new constitution a more characteristically Russian form of rule—a strong presidential republic. A compromise solution to this problem leads to an imbalance between the branches of power and, furthermore, enshrines new contradictions in the Basic Law. Russian People's Deputy Yu. Ryzhov also believes that the proposed model, based on conditions pertaining in Russia, threatens instability.

It is obvious that all these problems will form the subject of the work of the Constitutional Arbitration Commission during the coming week. The theme of the next plenary session, as the president declared, will be the

mechanism for the adoption of the new constitution. Here, too, there will be just as many hidden reefs, given the nature of the sociopolitical situation in the country and the new eruption of confrontational attitudes in parliament. However, let us note once more that the president is not abandoning hope of elaborating a single draft. The latest plenary session merely reinforced his hopes. The immediate future will show whether those hopes are justified.

'Momentum' of Constitutional Process Maintained

PM3006094393 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 1

[Anatoliy Stasovskiy report: "Constitutional Conference: From Dissension to National Concord? Momentum of Constitutional Process Maintained at Fourth Plenary Session"]

[Text] After the completion of the fourth plenary session of the Constitutional Conference session, it can be said with a certain degree of surety and optimism that work on the draft of the new constitution, which initially provoked so many passions, is gradually turning into a real opportunity to achieve national concord within the country. Participants in the plenary session unanimously noted that the draft Fundamental Law is taking on the shape of a document which takes account of all the best aspirations and proposals of many political and social forces and organizations.

Briefly summarizing the essence of the work accomplished during the Constitutional Conference, it should be noted first of all that maybe one of the most acute problems was resolved—the federal structure of the Russian Federation was determined. Most important, the equal rights of Russia's citizens are guaranteed; this is achieved by the retention of the institution of single citizenship and by guarantees regarding human rights and freedoms.

Another key factor in the work of the conference, also not without importance, is that federation components are ensured equal rights. As is well known, the republics within the Russian Federation are deemed to be sovereign states, while krais, oblasts, and autonomous formations are deemed to be state-territorial formations.

Observers note also that the draft of the new constitution enshrines guarantees for the economic fundamentals of the unity of Russia. These are freedom of movement of goods, services, and financial resources, and a ban on internal customs and other restrictions. As has also been repeatedly stressed, the complex problem of the synthesis of the Fundamental Law per se and the Federation Treaty has been successfully resolved. The latter has been incorporated into the constitution in the form of a separate section.

Despite the fact that participants in the plenary session expressed cautious optimism as regards maintaining the momentum of the constitutional process, it is mistaken

to suggest that full consensus has been reached. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Constitutional Commission continues to labor over its draft of the constitution. The commission plans to submit this draft for examination by parliament by mid-July. At the same time the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet rejected 25 June the proposal of some deputies that it take part in the work of the Constitutional Conference in order to elaborate a single draft Fundamental Law. Such proposals, incidentally, are being heard increasingly, and not only in parliament. But despite forecasts that the Russian parliament would not in the end be able to remain aloof from the constitutional process, no visible rapprochement in the positions of the conference and of parliament can yet be discerned. On the contrary, the charges presented 24 June at the Supreme Soviet session by First Deputy General Prosecutor Nikolay Makarov, head of the special commission of the Russian Federation General Prosecutor's Office for the investigation of materials connected with corruption among officials, have been assessed as an attempt to hinder the normal work of the conference. A statement to this effect was made, in particular, by President Boris Yeltsin before the start of the plenary session 26 June.

Opening the fourth plenary session of the Constitutional Conference, Boris Yeltsin said that, as a result of intensive work on the part of conference participants and the working commission, we now have a single draft Russian Constitution.

The version presented to conference participants, Boris Yeltsin noted, is distinct also from both the version initially proposed by the president and the Constitutional Commission's draft. This is the result of a creative reworking, a synthesis of these drafts, and not the mechanical sum of diverse proposals and formulas. It takes account of all that is best in both drafts.

This was also mentioned by Aleksandr Yakovlev, coordinator of the group of federal organs of power at the Constitutional Conference. He noted that more than 200 provisions in the president's original draft constitution were amended, only three articles remaining unchanged. Therefore, Aleksandr Yakovlev said, what we have now does not deserved to be labeled in any way, either as the president's draft or as that of the Constitutional Commission.

In conversation with journalists on the results of the fourth plenary session President Boris Yeltsin expressed satisfaction with its results. He said that the next session would take place directly after the working group and the Commission for Constitutional Arbitration (which, let us recall, includes judges from the Constitutional Court, the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court of Arbitration, and a number of nationally famous lawyers) finish their work on the proposals and criticisms voiced.

Political Issues

Yeltsin Appoints Two Officers to Security Council

LD3006092993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0912 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By unidentified ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—President Boris Yeltsin signed a resolution appointing two military men to work in the National Security Council. Lieutenant-General Valeriy Manilov became assistant secretary of the council while Colonel Vladimir Markin is now head of its secretariat.

Earlier Yeltsin appointed Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov as secretary of the Security Council, however, the parliament failed to approve the appointment on Wednesday [30 June] and will return to the issue in a week.

Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin also introduced some changes in his government. First Deputy Premier Oleg Soskovets now chairs the Commission on Export Control, while former Deputy Premier Georgiy Khizha was appointed head of the Expert Council at the government.

Albert Bogdanovich became deputy railway minister, Aleksandr Tikhonov—first deputy chairman of the State Committee on Higher Education, while Pavel Afanasyev, Vasilii Zhurakovskiy, Valeriy Meskov and Vladimir Shadrikov became deputy chairmen of the said committee.

Yeltsin Names Anti-Crime Directorate Head

LD2906125093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 29 Jun 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Andrey Makarov, a lawyer from the Moscow City Collegium of Lawyers, has been appointed head of the directorate to ensure the activity of the interdepartmental commission of the Russian Federation Security Council for combating crime and corruption in accordance with an instruction by the president of Russia.

Poltoranin: Khasbulatov 'Stage-Managed' Property Issue

LD2906125893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1031 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun (ITAR-TASS)—Mikhail Poltoranin, head of Russia's Federal Information Center, today made the following statement to an ITAR-TASS observer:

The scandalous session of the Russian Supreme Soviet, at which Procurator Makarov made a speech, has had

repercussions in the Federal Republic of Germany. Several official courts in Germany have reacted immediately to the situation regarding the Berlin House of Science and Culture which the procurator, citing German judicial bodies, represented as a loss-making situation for Russia. In particular, the Regional Court and the Board of Trustees have sent documentary confirmation to Moscow that the Berlin House, from 1992 onward (after I signed the corresponding agreement), was and henceforth would remain the property of Russia with all the consequences which result from this.

All this could easily have been uncovered if the procuracy had checked, but Makarov, evidently, did not set himself the task of reaching the truth but rather one of carrying out a special political order.

One could finish there, but I cannot ignore the following circumstances.

Dozens of expensive foreign offices built in the past using our country's money and which have ended up belonging to nobody as a result of the collapse of the USSR are frequently being used today - to judge from reports in the western press - to make the international communist mafia rich. The attempt to bring just one of these building under Russian jurisdiction - the Berlin House - so that it worked for the needs of our economy, has, over the last year and a half, already come up against fierce resistance from high-ranking Russian officials.

First of all, circles close to [Valentin] Falin [former Central Committee secretary, Soviet ambassador to FRG, and deputy chairman of USSR-FRG Society] in the government initiated anti-Russian proceedings in Germany to restore the USSR's vague jurisdiction over the Berlin building. Subsequently, Aleksandr Rutskoy distorted the Berlin situation for political ends. For the same political ends the leadership of the Supreme Soviet fired off a noisy salvo at their "eternal" opponent, from the new weapon they have ganged up with—Makarov's "independent system".

The position of the leaders of Russia's law enforcement agencies has long given rise to concern in society. The procuracy hushed up or failed to complete (there's no real difference) its investigation into the CPSU's funds. Basically, it also obstructed the State Committee for the State of Emergency case. No answer has been given to a pressing question: what is happening to the huge sums of hard currency received from the use of property abroad, above all the buildings of the former Union of Soviet Friendship Societies? Neither is anything significant being done to combat what really is called corruption. Instead of performing their professional duty, the leadership of the procuracy frequently act as a tool in the hands of the Khasbulatov grouping, a tool which is used to unleash political persecution and provoke anti-presidential hysterics.

In all probability Khasbulatov, who in Russia's Supreme Soviet represents a republic with incomprehensible legal status—to be more precise, he represents only himself—

has only one problem today, his own political survival. This is the reason for all his psychological warfare and absurd attempts to weaken state power, as such. It is a very strange fact that many deputies, who call themselves Russian patriots, are biting on the rotten bait of confrontation with the president and conniving in the speaker's policies, which are so ruinous for Russia.

In protesting against the political stunts stage-managed by Khasbulatov, I demand that the Russian Supreme Soviet apologize for the ethical slur against me. Since I place little hope in the objectivity and professionalism of various "independent" prosecution groups, I ask the foreign media to investigate where the hard currency earned from the use of Russian cultural buildings in many countries actually went to.

Yerin: Supreme Soviet Wrong Forum for Makarov Charges

PM2906153393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 1

[Sergey Ovsienko report: "Viktor Yerin: The Use of Investigation Materials for Political Purposes is Impermissible"]

[Text] Our correspondent asked the Russian Internal Affairs Minister to comment on Deputy General Prosecutor N. Makarov's speech in the Supreme Soviet.

[Yerin] A commission set up by directive of the president is working on Aleksandr Rutskoy's well-known speech in parliament. The commission includes experienced staffers not only from the Russian Prosecutor's Office but also the Control Administration, the Security Ministry, and the Internal Affairs Ministry. What I want to stress is that this is a collective operation.

However, this idea was not duly reflected in N. Makarov's speech. I am categorically opposed to the political use of operational investigation materials pertaining to cases which have been instituted and are being examined. This is intolerable.

Documents relating to cases under investigation should go not to the rostrums of important assemblies but to the prosecuting attorney in the form of indictments, which should then be examined by the judges to pass judgement.

Court Urged To Investigate Leadership Crimes

PM3006092993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 93 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Parliamentary Observer Aleksey Vorobyev commentary: "Are We Again Expecting Everything To Come Down Around Our Ears and Confirm Our Worst Suspicions?"]

[Text] When First Deputy General Prosecutor Nikolay Makarov told deputies about the preliminary results of the investigation into crimes being committed deep

within the supreme authority, you got the impression that something similar had already occurred in our country. Rumors about incredible happenings in the Kremlin and on Staraya Square [former headquarters of CPSU Central Committee] had already done the rounds, individual episodes had come to light.... And in exactly the same way as today, you did not want to believe what was happening. Because it was frightening to believe such a thing.

But, as Yuriy Trifonov wrote in one of his novels, "...one day everything came down around our ears and confirmed our worst suspicions." And the 20th Congress burst upon us and the amazed people were finally faced with the somber years of Stalinism, not in individual details but in the whole tragic criminal panorama.

The times are repeating themselves and they are teaching us little if we ourselves, answering before our own conscience, do not want to learn anything. It is hard to imagine how those who immediately joined the persecution campaign against Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy as soon as he dared to slightly raise the veil over the lawlessness that has been going on will tomorrow look those close to them in the eye. The "democratically" minded deputies long engaged by the executive power, not one—not one!—of whom found the courage to mount the parliamentary rostrum, will also find it hard to explain themselves to the electorate. All right, let them not repent, but they should at least protect their leaders somehow. Only Mikhail Mityukov called out to Ivan Galushko, who was on his way to the rostrum, that the court could also reject a lot of accusations.

It is hard to disagree. A court trial can do so. But the main thing is that one should take place. In every open and public episode under investigation, with the involvement of all the suspects, accomplices, and witnesses—irrespective of rank, post, and merit. And if the court deems it possible to acquit the accused, then this is also a step in the formation of our civic society, which will no longer have to answer the question of who is guilty but to understand how this could have happened. What is it that the country lacks for it to be able to root out this serious disease?

How could the president, in whom is vested the trust of the poverty-stricken and unfortunate people, fail to react to the materials he was sent regularly on the robbery of the peasants within the framework of the "Harvest-90" program, when, according to the testimony of the prosecutor's office, hundreds of millions of dollars were stolen from the treasury and appropriated? How did he, according to the same information, allow himself to be drawn into G. Burbulis's shady ventures with the red mercury and M. Poltoranin's shady ventures with the Soviet Science and Culture Center in Berlin?

Why, finally, did Russian citizen Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, the fighter for the truth, as we have called him, who doubtless knows about the fall in the birth rate in the country and the disastrous situation of Russian

infants, not simply expose the first vice premier and the head of the Moscow Oblast Administration—it is under their cover that a small group of rascals are getting rich on the most sacred thing, baby food? Around \$14 million disappeared into Swiss bank accounts as part of this project, while to this day young mothers have nothing with which to feed their babies.

No matter what attempts we may make to use political considerations and economic realities to vindicate those involved in the cases made public by the prosecutor's office, and no matter how busy and uninformed we may say the president is, the country's citizens will have to establish for themselves: Why did we put up with all this?

A society which is incapable of answering such questions is doomed to disaster.

No doubt now is the moment of truth for parliamentarians: If, even after what Prosecutor N. Makarov said, they are not able to establish control over the actions of officials in the state apparatus, if they do not have enough skill, courage, and responsibility to do this, then they really must get out straightaway. In order not to discredit parliamentarism and democracy in Russia once and for all.

But if the individuals in the Kremlin and on Staraya Square again view these attempts at control as a desire for confrontation, then that alone confirms both the accusation of bribery and the citizens' doubts concerning their ability to lead a great country.

Cabinet Members' Activities Reported

PM2906153993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed feature: "Executive Branch Monitoring"]

[Excerpt] Trips, Conferences

Russian Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin met with his Ukrainian counterpart Leonid Kuchma in Kharkov.

First Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets conducted a conference with leaders of industrial sectors on questions of conversion and in the afternoon met with directors of the defense sectors of industry. Attention was focused on questions of preserving highly efficient technologies and the conversion of defense sectors. Representatives of the Russian Defense Ministry and the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Sectors of Industry took part in the meeting.

First Vice Premier Oleg Lobov is on official business in the FRG.

Vice Premier Aleksandr Zaveryukha chaired a session of the council of the Association of Peasant (Private) Farms and Agricultural Cooperatives on the theme of problems of the Russian agro-industrial complex.

Vice Premier Anatoliy Chubays is on official business in St. Petersburg.

Vice Premier Yuriy Yarov met with leaders of ministries and departments under his jurisdiction. [passage omitted]

Coup Plotters To Sue for Loss of Reputation

LD2906145693 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jun 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Members of the State Committee for the State of Emergency announced today their intention to sue the procuracy for millions of rubles [R] and \$100,000 each for the damage caused to their reputation during the investigation. Valentin Pavlov is demanding the largest sums - R7.2 million and \$120,000. The rest are asking for more modest sums, evidently regarding themselves as having suffered less, but even they are demanding at least R6 million and at least \$100,000.

Rutskoy Views Domestic, Foreign Issues

AU2906113393 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 26 Jun 93 p 16

[Interview with Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy by Laszlo Vida in Moscow; date not given: "If the Soviet Union Still Existed, the Events in Yugoslavia Would Not Develop So Dramatically, Either"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Vida] Mr Rutskoy! What is your opinion of the referendum carried out in April?

[Rutskoy] From the very beginning, I kept saying that there was no need for a referendum. Economic and political changes demand the cooperation of all the elements of power, and not the clarification of relations between various elements of power. There are laws and there is a constitution, and everyone has to carry out his own task in accordance with this. Personal controversies led to a political crisis, and differences of views between the president and the deputy president, as well as between the president and the parliament chairman, originate from the totally mistaken way leading to the new economic forms. It is an axiom that, in a state economy based on monopolies, one cannot start reforms with a price liberalization. Reforms should have been started in another order: first to break the monopolies and start privatization, and only then to liberalize the prices. [passage omitted]

[Vida] You openly declared that you would like to run for the position of president. Do you expect elections?

[Rutskoy] The crisis of our statehood is the most alarming thing. It would be problematic to call Russia a state today: Our borders are not defended, our economic interests are not protected either, the reform of the political institutions failed to take place, and no one is directing the economic processes here. Where are the

elementary attributes of statehood? As long as there are no answers to all these questions, we will not be able to extricate ourselves from this dead end street. In my opinion, the solution lies in new elections. It is impossible to compromise with those for whom the violation of laws became a norm. You do not like them? Here, there is a way to change these laws.

Can you imagine Clinton, for example, seeking support from Kohl in dissolving the Congress that is making a lot of troubles? Of course, you cannot imagine such a thing. Then, why did Yeltsin ask advice from Clinton, Kohl, and other Western figures almost every week on what to do with the "communist" parliament? Is this not a nonsense? How can one support something that leads to confrontation and the disregard of laws? This situation threatens a repeat of all this in Europe and the United States as well. If they support illegal steps here, why could we not do the same....?

[Vida] The West is trying to protect the reforms and thinks that your parliament is hindering the reforms in Russia.

[Rutskoy] Really, who opposes the reforms? The only thing is that transition to a market economy should not be spontaneous but the state should play certain regulatory roles. Skolov, the recently resigned secretary of the National Security Council, said this, and so did Khasbulatov and myself. As a result, we were labelled as persons who are conservative and who oppose the reforms. And what did I read now in the 15 June decision of the government? The situation of various industrial sectors must be thoroughly analyzed, a plan of action must be drawn up to implement the economic reforms, and proposals must be made for measures connected with state regulations. Is this not what we have been talking about? And now the cabinet comes up with all this. The government woke up two years after Skolov, Khasbulatov, and many others, including outstanding economists, rang the alarm bells. [passage omitted]

[Vida] What political forces have the best hopes in the elections?

[Rutskoy] Radical reformers, or "democrats" as we call them here, have no future, because people still have vivid memories of the draining of the economy and the social sphere committed by these people. The neobolsheviks do not have better chances either, and the communist idea has no prospects whatsoever at the moment. The future belongs to the center, despite the official propaganda claiming that there are no center forces here. Of course there are. We, those who think alike, and the heads of the Civic Union established a "coalition of center forces" made up of forty parties. We reject any kind of radicalism, both right-wing and left-wing radicalism. It is true that the strong political confrontation has created a temporary power vacuum in the center, and a sudden polarization has taken place, namely either we or them. One should remember that

this alternative was created deliberately, with considerable help from the mass media. They keep terrifying the West with the prospect of a "red-brown revenge." The constant political and economic cataclysms repeatedly convince our compatriots that they must reject extremism.

[Vida] What do you think about your own chances? There is a rather widespread view that there is no reason for the reelection of the president because Yeltsin is the only favorite anyway.

[Rutskoy] We will see. Unfortunately, it is part of the Russian mentality that there is no alternative to Yeltsin. In other words, either Yeltsin and democracy, or fascism. You know, in Russia, people always thought that there was no alternative to anyone, Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, or Gorbachev. Believe me, there have always been alternatives, and there is an alternative to Yeltsin as well. As for my possible running for the position of president, so far, I have refused to answer this question, because it was not ethical to talk about this. However, I had to answer it, because the attacks on me were against the law and the Constitution. It is nonsense that I am accused of nationalism and conservatism.... I am ready to run, at least to make sure that no such "democrats" gain power in the future.... [passage omitted]

[Vida] Mr Rutskoy! You are one among those who think that the collapse of the Soviet Union was hardly inevitable. However, one cannot undo this fact. How do you see the future of the CIS?

[Rutskoy] This country was not threatened with dismemberment until the Brest pact. Political and economic reforms became inevitable, and the new state administration should have been decided upon, but the Soviet Union could have been kept intact. Neither I nor Khasbulatov knew about the upcoming conspiracy—I cannot call the agreement signed near Brest differently. Kazakhstan also participated in the secret negotiations originally, but later they broke away because Nazarbayev returned to his senses. I only learned about what Yeltsin signed the following day. Interestingly enough, no one referred to the will of the people then. No wonder because, in March 1991, three quarters of the Russians living on the territory of the Soviet Union were for the Union. In spite of this, the tragedy took place, and we are just beginning to realize the consequences of this tragedy. I am sure that the events in Yugoslavia would not develop so dramatically if the Soviet Union still existed today. If there is a big power in the neighborhood, a power that one must reckon with, no one can be so courageous. [passage omitted]

[Vida] Mr Rutskoy! You have occasionally taken a very tough stand on the issue of conflicts that broke out on the territory of the former Soviet Union. This also led to concern among some politicians in Eastern Europe. There are people who again speak of a Russian threat. How could you calm us?

[Rutskoy] I have a feeling that the Hungarian Government would not like it either if Hungarians living in other countries were persecuted and treated as second-class citizens. There is nothing more villainous than persecuting someone because of his nationality. Russian or Hungarian, is it not the same? There is no idea in the world for which one can kill others. I think, therefore, that every state has the right to defend the interests of its citizens who find themselves living abroad. There are political and economic means to achieve this: sanctions that must be firmly implemented, without evasions and empty talk. Otherwise, blood will continue to flow. Everyone must take a stand in favor of respecting human rights, and this is not identical with interference in internal affairs. Every politician must be aware of the fact that he is responsible to the community of nations. [passage omitted]

Radio, TV To Go Off Air If No Funding

LD2906213393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] To end the bulletin, a report on our radio station. From approximately 1400 hours [1000 GMT] on 29 June, radio listeners were deprived of the opportunity of receiving the programs of Russian Radio on long wave in the 261 kHz range. Our correspondent was told at the Ministry of Communications that this happened in connection with the failure on the part of the all-Russian State Television and Radio Company to pay for a transmitter it leases from the ministry. It is known that Russian Radio is financed from the state budget. The payment of money necessary to pay for the lease of the transmitter has been held back by the Russian Ministry of Finance yet again. The Ministry of Communications has said that if the money is not paid by 1 July, the relay of both TV and radio broadcasts will cease. The issue is being tackled now. Now, over to Anatoliy Lysenko, Director General of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company

[Lysenko] If TV screens go blank and the radio falls silent, I am afraid that the government will come up against a great deal of trouble. I would like someone in the government to reflect on this issue, at long last. You can go there, you can ask, receive hundreds of promises, send severe sounding resolutions to the highest level, but no matter how many times you pronounce the word sugar, the taste in your mouth will not be any the sweeter for that. What is needed is not sugar, but a normal opportunity not to be a debtor, constantly stuck in the debt-trap. There is only one way out: The government ought to wake up and realize that, all in all, the structure of the national radio and TV is a priority structure. Tomorrow we might be given some money; I hope so. Anyway, well, maybe we will be given some money the day after tomorrow, but, after all, you know what the crux of the matter is. I even believe that maybe tomorrow we will be given all the money, but where is the guarantee that this will not happen again in July,

August, September, or October? Are we to live from one month to the next? One cannot live like that.

Russian TV Curtails Broadcasts

LD2906191493 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1714 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Unscheduled announcement]

[Text] Dear friends, because we have over-fulfilled the plan for the volume of television broadcasts by showing especially important, urgent programs not planned in advance—coverage, for example, of the work of congresses, sessions of the Constitutional Conference, sittings of the Constitutional Court—and because the Ministry of Finances is not allocating enough funds to pay for broadcast communications, our programs will finish earlier than the announced time today; they will end at 2345 with a report on the sitting of the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

Unfortunately, we cannot show you a number of programs we had planned to broadcast this evening: Crime Reports from the Screen, These Old Old Film Reels, From Avant-garde to Today, and a jazz concert. Tomorrow, for the same reason, Russian Television will go on air at 1205.

Further on Radio Broadcast Cuts

LD2906165393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] I would like straight away to convey apologies to faithful listeners who most regrettably may not actually be hearing these words on the air. The fact is that some of Russia's Radio transmitters have already been switched off, and it is not ruled out that in the next few days—the next few days, even—more of them may be switched off. We are not sure whether Muscovites can actually hear us on longwave now, for instance. Our Chita correspondent Vyacheslav Shirokov outlines the essence of the problem. Relays of Radio Russia have already been cut in the Transbaykal region.

[Shirokov] This week, alas! the 1.5 million inhabitants of Chita Oblast found out the hard way what an information blockade is: when central newspapers arrive in the Transbaykal region two or three days' late, television does not always reach far-flung districts, and the radio is silent altogether. The main reason the relaying of radio programs has been stopped is because we are all in debt to one another these days. Up to date, the telecommunications workers owe a total of 120 million rubles to Chitaenergo [Chita Power Engineering] representatives; the local and central television and radio companies, in their turn, owe 263 million rubles to the territorial television and radio center.

The power engineering workers were the first to go for broke in this situation. Without any ado they switched off the power supply to the main Chita transmitters, thereby leaving half the staff working there without

work, and listeners without any news. Since 26 April the Territorial Radio Broadcasting and Radio Communications Center, which relays programs from Moscow all over the Transbaykal territory, has essentially been working in arrears. The fact is that having set new fuel tariffs, the government has not allocated money to any of the television and radio companies in the country. Therefore, journalists are today compelled to search feverishly for funds to pay off their debts, while staff at the territorial radio broadcasting and communications center have been faced with the need to cut staff, because the prices—creeping up not just by the day but literally by the hour—are increasingly beyond the pocket of the local companies.

Of course, all this is only stating the facts, but while the three government departments involved seek a common language, the radio in Chita is silent.

[Shevkin] Competent officials explain this situation as being due to the fact that our state simply does not have enough money to finance relaying of the broadcasts even of the All-Russia Company. Let's hope that the problem will be settled in the next few days. If not, we shall be compelled to keep silent. And when the state gets hold of the money, you will know about it by the fact that we have come back on the air.

Economic Issues

Fedorov Cautiously Optimistic for Economy

LD3006091793 Moscow *ITAR-TASS in English* 0807 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Deputy Prime Minister Boris Fedorov expressed "cautious optimism" about future economic development of the country and said no "shock therapy" is in store.

"In several positions there is certain optimism in forecasting the development of the Russian economy", Fedorov told a press conference on Wednesday [30 June].

His optimism is based on "extremely limited credits to the CIS countries", on thirty per cent limits on credits of the Central Bank which have been observed in the second quarter, increases in the discount rate of the Central Bank and a certain stabilisation of the rouble against the dollar.

According to Fedorov, who is also the finance minister, the government has set the stabilisation mark of the rouble exchange rate at 1,100 per dollar within a five-per cent error margin. He added that the targeted figure concerns the coming 1.5-2 months. The rouble may then begin to rise, according to a press release of the Finance Ministry distributed at the press conference.

It said that "major hard currency amounts are expected to appear on the market before the end of the year which will allow the exchange rate to come closer to the parity of the purchasing power". According to the "FINANCIAL IZVESTIYA" newspaper, the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased of late despite a growing exchange rate.

Besides, the press release added that Russian banks have accumulated up to 14 billion dollars on their accounts and that "the outflow of capital tends to decrease".

Fedorov also predicted that despite free prices on coal from July 1 the index of inflation can be lower than fifteen per cent a month in the near future.

Speaking about the coming "G-7" summit in Tokyo Fedorov said that Russia is not going to ask for help there. "There can be no talk about any help to Russia, the word 'help' should be excluded...Our government is not asking for any help from anyone. We want to speak about normal cooperation in credits".

He added that the Russian Government will ask for fewer Western credits for purchases of goods as "it is not the business of the state, but of commercial banks and trading ventures".

In Tokyo the Russian delegation will insist that the West lifts discriminative barriers against Russia. "The West should allow our companies and enterprises to normally trade—it is in this sphere that the G-7 countries can really help us."

Zaveryukha Reports to Presidium on Food Imports

PM2906153593 Moscow *ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI* in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 7

[Veniamin Vylegzhanin article: "Subsidize Not the Import of Grain but the Domestic Consumers"]

[Text] A routine session of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers Presidium has examined the question of the food supply to Russia's inhabitants in the second half of 1993. Vice Premier Aleksandr Zaveryukha reported that before the end of the year Russia will need 27.5 million tonnes of grain, 2,452,600 tonnes of meat products, 17.36 million tonnes of milk products, 11.44 billion eggs, 4.7 million tonnes of sugar, 930,200 tonnes of vegetable oil. But because the harvest of grain crops, potatoes, and vegetables in Russia this year is expected to be at last year's level, it is planned to import 7.8 million tonnes of grain before the end of this year, 2.4 million tonnes of it from Kazakhstan. This is within the limits of the critical minimum import of grain for 1993 as a whole.

He said that the government's Food Commission considers it necessary as of 1 July 1993 to cease state-funded imports of potatoes, vegetables, spirits, wine, and non-alcoholic drinks, and also to reduce the import of all

kinds of foodstuffs. The vice premier instructed the Finance Ministry to draw up proposals to end grain import subsidies. This money, the deputy chairman of the government believes, should be used to support domestic consumers (pensioners and other needy sections of the population). In addition, he proposed that urgent economic measures be adopted to protect Russia's rural commodity producers.

Now a few words on meat and milk. Production of these foodstuffs in the second half of 1993 is expected to be slightly higher than in the same period last year. Therefore the commission considers it expedient to reduce the state-funded import of meat products by 170,000 tonnes and dairy products by 1.4 million tonnes. To satisfy the minimum requirements for vegetable oil in the second half year it is proposed to import only 370,000 tonnes in place of the previously planned 570,000 tonnes.

Chernomyrdin on Support for Rural Areas

LD2906203493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By correspondent V. Golubev on opening of Agrarian Union's second congress, including recording of interview with Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Golubev] Growing impoverishment in the countryside is the main result of the economic reform being implemented in Russia—this was a recurrent theme in the speeches of all participants in the second congress of the Agrarian Union of Russia, which opened in Moscow today. They blamed the government for the increasing disparity of prices, a slump in capital investment in agriculture, unfair distribution of land, and increase in imports of agricultural produce, which is ruinous to Russian farmers. The prime minister of Russia took part in a session of the congress. [addressing Chernomyrdin in Kremlin foyer] At all congresses and conferences of this kind, there are persistent demands that the government submit a clear-cut program of economic reform. Perhaps every person who lives and survives in our state today has a program of his own. For example, we saw displayed downstairs such a program as "Breeding chickens on garden plots" [shows Chernomyrdin a booklet].

[Chernomyrdin] A good program.

[Golubev] Yes, a good program. Yet, is it possible today to combine the interests of the whole nation to revive agriculture, and give it a push forward?

[Chernomyrdin] Well, you know, you are right. Even at the congress today a lot was said about the need for such a program, an integrated program. It is, indeed, necessary—though personally I am not a great fan of all those programs. There have been so many of them: food programs, programs for non-food production, programs for developing non-black soil zones, for supplying gas, electricity and so on. And we also know what they all

resulted in. To answer your question in one word, our task, the government's task today is to support this program, to support family farming, to support collective farming, collective and state farms—this is what we need today. We must develop a system of measures, a mechanism for supporting all of these.

Cited on Agricultural Credits

LD2906210993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Addressing the second congress of the Russian Agrarian Union today, Viktor Chernomyrdin stated that support for the agro-industrial complex is the main priority in the Government's activities. He recalled that the first thing the current Cabinet did at the start of the year was to make considerable resources available in order to carry out spring field work. In all, the so-called sowing credit for the agro-industrial complex amounts to 900 billion rubles. It has also been found possible to increase the total sum of budget expenditure for agriculture to 2.20 trillion rubles.

However, according to Chernomyrdin, the state has nearly exhausted its potential for supporting agriculture. Speaking of the issue of reforming production relations in the countryside, Viktor Chernomyrdin came out in favor of all forms of ownership.

Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy also addressed the congress. He supported the view of those delegates who accuse the government of not having a well-defined agrarian policy.

Agriculture Minister Expects 'Pretty Good' Harvest

LD2906124993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1052 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Dzyublo]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun—"A pretty good harvest is expected in the majority of Russia's regions, although several oblasts have suffered from drought, heavy rainstorms, and hail," Russian Federation Agriculture Minister Viktor Khlystun told an ITAR-TASS correspondent today. On the whole, he evaluated the situation as being "more or less favorable," pointing out that the harvest is expected to reach the level of last year, when according to some estimates 108 million tonnes of grain was gathered.

It has been decided to allocate 900,000 million rubles to the agro-industrial complex for the third quarter for the acquisition of equipment and fuel and purchases of wool and vegetables. The question of having the necessary funds to purchase the new season's grain is also being tackled. "The trouble is, unfortunately, that there is a considerable delay in credits arriving. This is creating a situation of some strain," the Russian agriculture minister said.

Central Bank Interest Rate Policy Applauded

PM2906125593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 5

[Report by Yelena Kremntsova: "Quickly Does Not Mean Hurriedly"]

[Text] Arnold Voylukov, first deputy chairman of the Central Bank, once said that the Current Bank of Russia leadership's main principle was "not to be in too much of a hurry."

Now we have another confirmation of this: The interest rate on Central Banks credits to commercial banks has been raised. But it is a gentle increase: from 110 to 120 percent per annum. And in June. Not by 1 May, as Vice Premier Boris Fedorov demanded in March.

So the Central Bank of Russia has killed two birds with one stone: It has acted within the framework of the agreement recently concluded between the Central Bank and the Russian government and, at the same time, it has kept faith with the industrialists and protected them from a further shock, which might have provoked a sharp increase in the refinancing rate to a considerably higher market level. Indeed, in many regions commercial organizations have long been paying 200 rubles [R] for R100 of credit.

According to information from authoritative sources, the Central Bank board of directors is carrying out its commitments under the agreement "with no great alacrity." Many Central Bank leaders still lack faith in the government's program, which expects 5-7 percent per month inflation by 15 July. Moreover, they predict yet another round of price increases.

According to Central Bank staff, prices will increase not only because of the increase in official interest rates, but also because the "budget" limit set for the second quarter has been exceeded. (Remember that according to an agreement with the government the Bank of Russia was supposed to allocate R1.4-1.5 trillion to the Finance Ministry this quarter). To all appearances it will be exceeded, but by how much exactly is a secret.

Nonetheless it is gratifying that despite its lack of faith the Central Bank has sympathized with the demands of the government and the commercial banks, which coincide in this matter. And it will soon establish a refinancing rate based on credit auctions. The first is planned for July. Its mechanism will be decided by a competition, for which, according to Central Bank press center data, there are three competing projects: those of the Organizational Bank (Orgbank), the Interbank Finance House, and the Savings Union [Kassovy Soyuz]. The leader of this team was the Interbank House, which streamlined the credit auction mechanism long ago. Whereupon it offered its services to the Central Bank "to ensure the civilized distribution of credits" and establishment of a bank rate on the basis of real supply

and demand. But the Central Bank research department was in no rush to evaluate the project.

It appears that the summer has melted these traditions somewhat.

Internal Affairs Aide Links Privatization, Crime Surge

PM3006080993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 5

[Report from INTERFAX, POSTFACTUM, RIA-NOVOSTI column: "Reds Plundering, Whites Plundering..."]

[Text] The privatization of state and municipal property in Russia has been accompanied by a large amount of crime, as Valeriy Nikolayev, deputy chief of the Internal Affairs Ministry investigation committee, said at a briefing in Moscow.

"Criminal organizations are more actively involved than ordinary citizens in the privatization process organized by Mr. Chubays," V. Nikolayev noted.

According to Internal Affairs Ministry data, in only the first five months of 1993 2,590 privatization-associated crimes were detected.... Some 27 crimes of this kind have been detected in Moscow in the past 18 months [as published]. "This 2,500 is the tip of the iceberg," Mikhail Serdyuk, first deputy chief of the Internal Affairs Ministry Main Administration for Economic Crimes, admitted at the briefing. According to him, the successful fight against economic crimes is being hampered by the lack of articles in the Criminal Code on bogus bankruptcies, fictitious enterprises, concealment of hard currency earnings, and so on. "Everything in Russia will have been plundered by the time the Supreme Soviet adopts a new Criminal Code and a new Criminal Procedure Code," Nikolayev then noted.

He announced that the law-enforcement bodies had managed to establish that the counterfeit vouchers that have flooded Russia are being printed in a Transcaucasian republic using good printing equipment.

Ministry Seen Moving Toward State Planning

PM2906150593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[Mikhail Berger report: "Ministry of Economy Prepares 'Indicative Five-Year Plan' for Us"]

[Text] The Ministry of the Economy has approved the draft Russian Federation law "On the Fundamentals of Indicative Planning and the Forecasting of Socioeconomic Development," which was drawn up in the innermost recesses of the ministry. Familiarization with the text of the draft gives grounds for considering that the Ministry of the Economy is continuing to move confidently in the planned direction: the restoration of state planning functions and state planning.

According to the scheme of the Ministry of the Economy, an indicative plan is drawn up both for Russia as a whole and for all its territories. It includes, inter alia, a plan-regulating section, which the document says is of an "obligatory nature." For the state to effectively influence the economy, it is proposed to introduce a system of economic regulators consisting "of a package of physical, value, and normative indicators." Words dear to the heart of any planner, are they not?

The draft law is not devoid of romanticism, which, incidentally, was characteristic of the whole Soviet system of planning, not one of whose five-year plans was ever fulfilled. The romanticism of the present document consists in the fact that its authors propose making forecasts on the basis of an analysis of resource potential, the possibilities of scientific and technical progress, the present sociopolitical situation, and information on the intentions of enterprises, associations, and unions in all forms of ownership. The last point is particularly interesting: how the Ministry of the Economy intends to acquire information on the intentions of private firms and companies, particularly as it intends to make forecasts, as stipulated, for one year, for three to five years, and for 10-15 years.

The indicative plan drawn up by the Ministry of the Economy and other organs is submitted to the Supreme Soviet. The government must make annual reports to parliament on the results of implementing the plan. As has long been the case, it is proposed that the (indicative) plans be submitted to the Supreme Soviet "no later than 1 September of the year preceding the planned period," and they must be submitted to the Ministry of the Economy no later than 1 July.

The draft contains the very odd concept of the "indicative plan target." If the plan really is indicative, i.e. tentative, declaring some intentions, and no more than that, what targets can there be? If there are targets, what is the word "indicative" doing here? Some comfort is given by the fact that the draft provides for the Russian president to be granted the right to a "deferring veto of individual points in an indicative plan."

Naturally, the budget commission is entrusted with monitoring the implementation of indicative plans.

So that the public correctly understands the line of the Ministry of the Economy "on market state planning," Oleg Lobov's order relating to publication of the weekly newspaper *EKONOMIKA I UPRAVLENIYE* [Economy and Management] is waiting to be signed at the ministry. The compilers of the order write with Roman directness: "For the purpose of more efficiently resolving the tasks occasioned by the strengthening of the role of the Ministry of the Economy as the executive's central organ in the state management of the country's socioeconomic development... I order that the newspaper *EKONOMIKA I UPRAVLENIYE* be set up as the press organ of the Ministry of the Economy."

According to the order, this organ will carry out explanatory work with regard to the efforts of the Ministry of the Economy aimed "at restoring the manageability of the economy as a unified national economic complex under market conditions."

Precisely what is meant by "restoring manageability" can be seen quite well from the draft law on indicative planning.

Jan-May Economic Figures Quoted

PM2506111593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[State Committee for Statistics report: "Production Output Has Declined by One-Third"]

[Text] In January through May Russia's produced national income declined 17.4 percent compared with the same period last year and the volume of production declined 18.7 percent. Compared with the first five months of 1990 industrial output in the country has declined by one-third. The average daily production output in May was 3.1 percent greater than in April.

Not one sector of industry has managed to reach last year's production level. A certain leveling out has appeared only in a number of subsectors of the fuel industry, in ferrous metallurgy, machine building, and the chemical industry. Average daily production in May increased by comparison with April for 109 types of output of the 263 counted in regular reports. They include automobile gasoline, diesel fuel, motorized cranes, excavators, buses, trolleybuses, tractor mowers, mineral fertilizers, cement, precast ferroconcrete, cotton textiles, refrigerators and freezers, canned dairy goods, soft drinks, butter, cheese, and brynza [jewe's milk cheese].

At the same time for half the types of output taken into account, the reduction in production compared with May last year was 25 percent and more. They include diesel engines and diesel generators, large electric machines, forge and pressing machines, bulldozers, feed harvesting combines, soda ash, chemical yarns and threads, commercial timber, lumber, paper, cardboard, rolled roofing materials and insulating material, shoes, radio receivers, cameras, margarine, canned meat, tea, and pasta.

In May over 2,400 industrial enterprises had stoppages of all or individual production facilities, mainly caused by the lack of raw material, semifinished materials, subassemblies, and fuel (45 percent of losses of working time) and difficulties in selling their output because of consumers' insolvency (42 percent). Losses of work time over the five months were in excess of 35 million man-days, that is each worker lost an average of nearly two working days during this time.

The entire area of spring crops sown by agricultural enterprises was 62.6 million hectares as of 14 June,

which is 3.9 million hectares less than last year. Spring grain crops are sown to 37.8 million hectares as against 39.2 million last year.

The output of livestock raising products over the first five months of the year reduced 10-11 percent compared with the corresponding period last year. Compared with January through May 1990 the sale of livestock and poultry for slaughter and the production of milk declined 60-70 percent and the receipt of eggs declined by one-quarter.

The numbers of large horned cattle at agricultural enterprises decreased 10 percent compared with 1 June 1992 including an 8 percent reduction in the number of cows, a 17 percent reduction in the number of pigs, and 18 percent reduction in sheep and goats, and a 3 percent reduction in the number of poultry.

In January through May enterprises and organizations of all forms of ownership used 3.7 trillion rubles [R] in capital investments, which is 5 percent less than over the same time last year. Over the five months enterprises and organizations of all forms of ownership commissioned housing with a total area of 6.7 million square meters that is at the level of the same period last year but 48 percent less than for the first five months of 1990.

Consumer prices in May compared with December last year rose 190 percent and rose 19 percent compared with this April.

Prices for food goods in May compared with December 1992 increased 180 percent (17.3 percent over May) and for industrial goods they increased 130 percent (15.5 percent over May).

The trend continues toward the more rapid growth of prices and rates for paid services to the population. Over the course of May they increased 34 percent and since the start of the year they have risen sevenfold. In May there was a drastic increase in the cost of communications services—100 percent—and of housing and municipal services—70 percent—while the cost of excursion services increased 60 percent and the cost of children's maintenance in preschool institutions 50 percent.

The population's money incomes in January through May totalled R10.8 trillion and increased 10.2 times compared with the same period last year while money expenditure was R8.5 trillion, increasing by a factor of 9.9. Average wages for workers in Russia in May are estimated at R37,000 and increased 20 percent compared with the previous month.

The excess of money revenue over expenditure was R2.1 trillion, the release of money into circulation was R2.2 trillion, which is 11.4 times more than for the first five months of last year.

Russia's foreign trade turnover in January through May was \$21.4 billion (it has declined 24 percent compared with January through May 1992). Exports were \$14.4

billion (compared with the corresponding period last year they increased 3.2 percent) while imports were \$7 billion (50 percent less).

Official Economic Statistics Questioned

PM2506131793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Boris Pinsker "Appraisal" article: "Government Does Not Know What Is Going On in the Economy"]

[Text] The latest statistics indicate that the state of our economy is determined by guesswork. Forgive me for saying so, but by sticking a finger up in the air.

Let me start with the most painful indicator—inflation. Various sources estimate it at 2,000-3,000 percent in 1992, that is, 30-35 percent a month. Since surveys containing information about price hikes for 70 most important consumer goods in 132 cities always report that 30-40 named products were regularly out of stock at trading outlets, one may conclude that the calculation was based on administratively controlled prices. And this means that the real increase in prices in 1992 (counting the black, gray, and other markets) should be estimated at 5,000-7,000 percent (and over 10,000 percent for foodstuffs).

The price hikes are notable for their unevenness. Thus, for instance, food in Voronezh Oblast is constantly 40-50 percent cheaper than in Moscow. Presumably such vagaries must give rise to the emergence of monopolies and crime in interoblast trade. However, various observers are virtually unanimous in thinking that intra-territorial trade is also characterized by an extremely high level of monopolization and crime. The general opinion is that every businessman pays 10-15 percent of his turnover to organized racketeers, who, in turn, provide some security and assist in reducing the taxes paid to the budget. It can be concluded that in the past year of reform the black market system has not grown weaker, as might have been expected, but has grown stronger and developed its own tax system.

You will agree that this is a serious conclusion. However, the public has not been informed of it. And there is every indication that the government is not reacting at all to this dangerous situation.

Although the Gaydar government until the end of its days kept on claiming that it had reduced the budget deficit to 5-7 percent of GNP, I have reason to take a skeptical view of this achievement. First, that kind of budget deficit corresponds to a far lower level of inflation (no more than 100 percent a year). Second, one can conclude from the patchy data regarding the ratio between budget revenue and expenditure that the deficit totals 35-40 percent of GNP. At any rate in Ukraine, which announced a government budget deficit for 1992 of 35 percent, the level of inflation was comparable to that in Russia.

If you analyze these figures, you can probably say only one thing: Both the previous and the incumbent Russian Governments are not particularly fussy about the reliability of the economic statistics that they present to the public.

Now a word about the dynamics of agricultural and industrial production. There is a particularly large spread of opinion here. Ranging from moderate optimism voiced by government sources (GNP dropped 18-20 percent, but the decline has been halted) to dramatic pessimism on the part of the opposition (according to Rutskey, the slump has already totaled over 30 percent of GNP and may top 50 percent in 1993).

The last estimate seems a patent exaggeration, particularly if you consider that even in 1942, at the worst moment of the war, when a considerable proportion of the country's European territory was under occupation, 20 million men were in the Army, 6 million were in jail, and millions of people of working age had died, production dropped by 62 percent of the prewar level.

In short, there is every reason not to place too much confidence in either estimate. First, all calculations—before and now—are performed in notional constant prices, which is devoid of economic sense when you are working with aggregate indicators like GNP and national income. Nor is there any point in comparing production levels at current prices owing to the rapid, uneven inflation.

In my view, official assessments should not be trusted either because 1990 is invariably used as a base—a year with an inadequate price system and a wholesale shortage of investment and consumer goods. And to this must be added the fact that since the beginning of 1992 80-90 percent of enterprises have stopped submitting statistics and our country has of late conducted virtually none of the selective surveys so popular in Western economic systems. So, strictly speaking, the government has simply no chance of knowing for sure what precisely is going on in the country's economy,

Thus, for various reasons—inflation, the change in price structure, production structure, and the rules of economic activity, and the complication of trade with former republics of the USSR and Europe's former socialist countries—our country is in a state of recession. But the influence of the recession on the population's standard of living and economic activity is by no means unambiguous. Take the following simple example. According to Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations estimates, in 1992 trade fell 30-40 percent. But, according to G. Khanin, the well known specialist in economic statistics, during the first seven months of 1992 there was either simply no decline in export and import trade, or a decline of no more than 3-5 percent.

Given that the "missing" 40 percent of foreign trade comprises procurements of consumer goods (clothing, cars, cigarettes, medicines) and that this money was spent on buying industrial equipment and raw materials

under the planned economy, the well-being of a section of the population can be expected to have risen sharply. Despite all the signs of a general deterioration in the country's economic position. But let us not be surprised at the unexpected conclusion: In the long term this change in import structure will inevitably cause very serious problems for the national economy.

Military Issues

Arms Exports Statistics for Jan-May 1993 Reported

MK2906120093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 29, 29 Jun 93 (signed to press 28 Jun) p 3

[Unattributed report: "Russian State Committee for Statistics on Arms Export"]

[Text] According to State Committee for Statistics operations data, from January through May 1993 Russia exported armaments worth \$546.1 million. In that number were armaments worth \$10.9 million to former Council for Mutual Economic Assistance countries; \$204.2 million to the People's Republic of China, Yugoslavia, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; \$36.2 million to industrial countries; and \$294.8 million to developing countries.

New Allegations Link Grachev to Mercedes

PM2906144593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 93 First Edition p 4

[Vyacheslav Kocherov report under the rubric: "Returning to a Previous Article": "Sharp Bends in the Mercedes Case"]

[Text] The press is once again displaying interest in Defense Minister Pavel Grachev's Mercedes cars. It is reported that another 12 cars of the same make, but of unknown origin, have been added to the two which our newspaper has already written about (the latest article was in the 24 April edition—"Pavel Sergeyevich Acquires Mercedes Only With Boris Nikolayevich's Permission").

Thus, on 13 July and 14 August of last year, two Mercedes-500 SEL cars worth 159,391 and 160,099.6 Deutsche marks [DM] respectively, were acquired at a branch of the Mercedes Benz firm in Berlin using Western Group of Forces money which had been allocated for the construction of housing for servicemen's families.

The two cars were taken by military transport aviation aircraft from Sperenberg airport to Chkalovsk airport (near Moscow) on 15 July and 17 August 1992. The Mercedes dispatched to Chkalovsk 17 August, which was worth DM160,099.6, was paid for by the Spanish "Transider" firm. The bank issued a check for the sum of DM175,000, because that was the price that the seller originally asked for. However, later, when the check was

already in the hands first of Major General G. Burmistrov, and then a certain O. Pilyugin, the Mercedes Benz firm lowered the price. The car cost the Russian side DM14,900.4 less—and this money, for unknown reasons, did not reach the Western Group of Forces treasury.

In all, there were plenty of all kinds of strange elements in this deal. First of all, the cars were not put on the books at the Western Group of Forces stores, but were sent straight to the address of Military Unit 42795 at Fryazino in Moscow Oblast. They were transported by aircraft, but without a permit for cross-border transportation. Furthermore, it was even "forgotten" to include them on the freight list. That is, they seemed not to be on board the aircraft either 15 July or 17 August. There was no customs check either in Sperenberg or in Chkalovsk.

In addition to all this, it must be stated that the Mercedes in which the defense minister and his foreign guests travel do not appear to belong to the Ministry of Defense at all, as both vehicles are registered in the name of Warrant Officer Vladimir Pronin.

And now for the most curious thing of all. By an agreement between the administration for the sale of Western Group of Forces property and "Transider," it was envisaged that the Spaniards would get not only 500 "Ural" cars for DM4,500 apiece, but also 2,000 steel tanks weighing 8,000 tonnes at DM42 per tonne, steel pipes weighing 21 tonnes at DM65 per tonne, 2,000 armored equipment engines weighing 1.500 tonnes at DM65 per tonne, 500,000 gas masks at DM25, and 7 tonnes of steel sheet at DM320.

However, by all accounts, all this property has not yet become the property of the Spanish firm...

The question arises: Why were so many tricks necessary in concluding and implementing a trade deal, if Boris Nikolayevich gave Pavel Sergeyevich official authorization for it?

Further on Defense Enterprise Conversion Conference

LD2906163593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1349 GMT 28 Jun 93

[By correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—Further delay in settling questions involved in conversion of defense enterprises could intensify crisis developments in the regions. This was stated today by Oleg Soskovets, Russian Federation first deputy prime minister, at a conference on conversion problems attended by representatives of federal ministries and directors of enterprises belonging to Russia's military-industrial sector.

According to Oleg Soskovets, defense enterprises have suffered the worst from economic restructuring and inadequate budget funding of industry. The intellectual

potential of the military-industrial sector is not being fully exploited at the moment. Attempts are frequently being made to attract foreign partners and to bring in technology from the West instead of using our own resources, the first deputy prime minister said.

Reviewing the results of the conversion program for 1992 Viktor Glukhikh, chairman of the Russian Federation committee on defense industries, disclosed that additional production capacity had been installed at only 274 enterprises, instead of 634 as planned, as a result of delays in issuing budget credit to defense enterprises. As a result the increase in civilian output had been 84 billion rubles [R] instead of R200 billion.

During the first five months of this year the overall fall in output from the military-industrial sector had been 19.6 percent compared with the same period last year. At the same time the fall in civilian output had been lower—13 percent, while the fall in production of consumer goods had been just 1 percent. Moreover, output of oil drilling equipment had increased by 19 percent, equipment for the knitwear industry by 5 percent, and domestic appliances by 5 to 8 percent.

Only R37 billion had been allocated for scientific research work last year, instead of the R175 billion which had been sought. As a result of this, institutes in the military-industrial sector have lost almost half of their orders for military and civilian products. About 20 percent of the specialists employed at these institutes have resigned.

In March this year average monthly wages at enterprises in the military-industrial sector amounted to R14,000—which is 70 percent of average wages elsewhere in the economy and 60 percent of industrial wages.

This year, Viktor Glukhikh said, enterprises in the defense sector will need financing to the tune of R400 billion at prices applicable in the fourth quarter of 1992. Assimilation of these funds would make it possible to produce goods worth R950 billion. However, the growth in production of civilian goods has been lower than planned during the first five months of this year. Inadequate budget support is once again the reason for this, Viktor Glukhikh said.

Supreme Soviet

Khasbulatov Postpones Trip Due to 'Heavy Work Schedule'

LD3006060193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0551 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov postponed his trip to a number of Russian cities because of a heavy work schedule of the parliament, his spokesman Konstantin Zlobin told TASS.

The speaker had to arrive in Penza region on Wednesday [30 June].

Today's parliamentary session is to be addressed by the finance minister who is to report on the 1993 budget.

Proceedings From 30 Jun Session Reported

To Discuss Draft Budget

LD2906095893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0926 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—An official representative of the Russian Government is to submit an updated draft budget of the Russian Federation for 1993 at 16:00 p.m. on June 30, Veniamin Sokolov, chairman of the House of the Republic of the Russian Parliament, reported at a morning session of the house today.

Government Submits Updated Budget

LD3006101193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0035 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] The Russian Government has submitted a new updated draft state budget for 1993 to the Supreme Soviet. According to the draft, the total budget deficit could amount to nearly 13 trillion rubles by the end of the year—more than one-tenth of the gross national product.

The new draft is more detailed. In deputies' opinion, this makes it easier to check.

The budget envisages the introduction of two new taxes along the lines of a value added tax. One is designed to support agriculture, the other, the coal industry. At the same time, however, in order to cushion the blow this deals to producers, allocations to various funds, including the pension fund, are to be reduced.

Even now it is quite obvious that the discussion of the document will lead to sharp political discussion in the Supreme Soviet.

To Discuss Top Officials' Tax Returns

LD3006082393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0731 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The Russian Parliament decided on Wednesday [30 June] to include in its agenda the issue of introducing tax returns for top Russian leaders and an article in the criminal code which will envisage punishment for dodging tax payments.

The proposal was submitted by Nikolay Pavlov from the hard-line parliamentary group "Russian Unity".

Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov instructed corresponding committees to prepare all the necessary documents for discussion in one week.

Shaposhnikov Denies Corruption Charges

LD3006123093 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0730 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Report by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy on 30 June session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, with recorded statement by Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Armed Forces]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] As far as I know, discussion is continuing of the question of corruption, a sensational subject, and here is our parliamentary correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy with the details. Hello, can you hear us?

[Ruvinskiy] Yes, I can hear you very well. You know, the question of corruption arose very unexpectedly. First, one of the people's deputies, Deputy Pavlov, proposed adopting a law at the Supreme Soviet in the immediate future to oblige deputies, and not only deputies but also top state leaders, to supply declarations of income, so that failure to supply such a declaration would be a criminal offense, so these declarations should be published. The Supreme Soviet decided to adopt such legislation in the very near future.

The question of corruption arose again in connection with the confirmation of Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov in the post of secretary of the Security Council. The point is that recently, speaking here in the Supreme Soviet, Deputy General Procurator Makarov mentioned Marshal Shaposhnikov among other persons the procuracy has claims against, and this is what Shaposhnikov himself said today replying to questions from people's deputies.

[Shaposhnikov] My appointment as defense minister of the USSR. Esteemed deputies, a document was submitted to me from the KGB which revealed abuse by the chief of (?Gutmo) [director of the Defense Ministry] Sadovnikov, his deputy Kruglov, and a certain Miroshnikov, head of the firm (?Interkom-tsent-formula-7). The result of their joint activity was a loss of 15 million German marks [DM]. Well, what could I do with these documents? I sent them to the Procuracy General. For reasons unknown to me they were returned. Having certain confirmation of the facts cited in these documents I decided to dismiss Sadovnikov and Kruglov from the Armed Forces, by which I clearly stirred up a hornets' nest of mafia structures or lawbreakers. With great difficulty General Karakozov was appointed to this post of head of (?Gutmo), who, working in [word indistinct], cut off several dozen firms from the opportunity of presenting their goods and shifted the relations of other firms on to a competitive basis, guided by the economic expediency of the Armed Forces. The firms that were cut off were deprived of certain profits, and along with them their highly-placed patrons—their

names we will have to discover in the course of the investigation. After this attacks began on Karakozov, and he received offers and threats. He reported some of these to me. Realizing what way the wind was blowing, I again sent these documents, this time to the Russian Deputy Procurator General Comrade Lisov. The documents remain there, but the attacks on Karakozov continue to intensify. Alongside his name my name appears more and more often. Comrades, for a long time I refrained from replying to all these matters. I simply did not consider it necessary to sink to the level of—the ladies will forgive me—[word indistinct].

But what am I being charged with? Here in this hall, on 15 April, Vice President Rutskoy stated that I had handed 12 airfields belonging to the air force of the Western Group of Forces to some dubious firm. I can reply: Not a single airfield from the air forces of the Western Group of Forces was handed over to any firm. There are documents. I will not mention for the moment what offers were sent to me by the vice president and other officials on airfields and other commercial issues, which I also rejected. Maybe it is for this reason that he cited my name. Or maybe he was using the old soldier's habit, or rule—the best form of defense is attack.

The program Vesti stated that the flags of the Chechen republic were flown above our garrisons in Grozny in my command. The most arrant lies and provocation.

The newspaper PRAVDA alleges that I gave an assurance to the NATO supreme commander in Europe General Shalikashvili that all his instructions relating to military action against Serbia would be carried out, and that I was ready to allocate forces and resources to direct NATO aircraft toward Serbian towns. This is a monstrous slander, I had to travel to NATO on this matter and address them on my position regarding Serbia. This is in the best traditions of 1937. Of course, if our domestic mass media carry such nonsense, the foreign media copy them.

Unfortunately certain deputies, in particular Deputy Galushko, citing the West German journal DER SPIEGEL, says that furniture was bought for me in the FRG through false persons. I can report to you, esteemed deputies, that neither I nor anyone else bought any furniture for me in the FRG. The procuracy knows about this. Deputy Makhanov alleges that I sold an aircraft to my brother. It's a good thing it was not a strategic missile or a nuclear submarine! [laughter] And the president gave me a dacha for my birthday—here, too, it's a good job it wasn't a mausoleum! More rubbish supplied, according to the deputy, by trading officials who have not yet lost their decency. But in my view it's the trading officials who have lost their decency and who were dismissed by me and Karakozov, and are now writing all kinds of libel and so on and so on. Special checks were made on both the aircraft and the dacha. The dacha was assessed by a special commission. Another commission, a procuracy commission, went to the dacha and considered all matters closed. What follows from this, esteemed

deputies? While we are accusing one another and justifying ourselves, the real criminals, setting us against each other and together with us the bodies of power and the judiciary, are carrying on their dirty business; they are trying to send the investigation in the direction they want, and while they themselves remain in the shadows they quietly rejoice and rub their hands. If things go on like this, in the end they will be commanding all of us. So I would like to say that I am not linked with any criminal or politicized groups. I have nothing to repent or to try and justify. My conscience is clear. I did not try and foist myself on this post, and I am not asking for it now. But if my appointment is successful, I can only promise you one thing—to work in the interests of Russia on the basis of the laws and only the laws. [passage omitted]

Shaposhnikov Appointment Put to Vote

LD3006093693 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0800 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Report by unidentified correspondent at a Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 30 June; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpts] The first unexpected thing at today's joint session of the Russian parliament was the appearance on the presidium of Ruslan Khasbulatov, who was supposed to be visiting Penza this morning. The first item on the agenda was examination of the Russian president's proposal to confirm Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov as secretary of the Security Council. Deputies fired questions at the air marshal, and most of all asked him to reply to the accusations of corruption and abuse in the Army that were made a week ago within the walls of parliament. [passage omitted]

Ruslan Khasbulatov then put the question of confirming Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov as secretary of the Security Council to a vote. A majority of deputies voted against it. Then the speaker admitted that he had violated the standing orders, as he had put the question to the vote without discussion. At the deputies' insistence, it was decided to hold an hour's discussion on the proposed candidacy.

Appointment Postponed

LD3006090193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0841 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The Russian Parliament blasted Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov on Wednesday [30 June] and the issue of approving his appointment as secretary of the Russian Security Council had to be postponed for a week.

Shaposhnikov faced bitter criticism and even insults from legislators and Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov had to

interfere to keep the tensions down. He proposed to postpone the discussion for a week.

Shaposhnikov, former commander-in-chief of the CIS Unified Armed Forces, was appointed to the post by the Russian president, but the decision was to be approved by parliament. He is to replace Yuriy Skokov who resigned in May.

Further on Shaposhnikov Debate

LD3006101293

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 0900 GMT on 30 June broadcasts a four-minute report on the Russian Supreme Soviet session in Moscow the same day. Correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy says among other things: "As a result of voting, the Supreme Soviet failed to endorse Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov's candidacy for the post of secretary of the Russian Federation Security Council. A discussion took place after this voting. The point is that deputies charged Shaposhnikov with a number of events described in the report by the Deputy Procurator General Makarov and described in a parliamentary speech by Aleksandr Rutskoy. In connection with this Shaposhnikov made a statement, rejecting all these charges and ending it with these words: My conscience is clear."

Ruvinskiy goes on: "One of the deputies, Belashov, in particular, was compelled to speak and to say that if insults against Marshal Shaposhnikov do not cease, the Air Force will come to his assistance. Other deputies, too, said that the Supreme Soviet's attitude toward Marshal Shaposhnikov evoked a sharply negative reaction among the officers of the Russian Armed Forces. Nonetheless, Deputy Sevastyanov accused Marshal Shaposhnikov of not being a patriot, while Deputy Pavlov went even further, charging Shaposhnikov with participation in the preparation of a coup d'etat."

Ruvinskiy adds: "The issue remained unresolved. What remains in force is the result of the voting, according to which Marshal Shaposhnikov has not been endorsed in the post of the secretary of the Security Council. True, Ruslan Khasbulatov proposed a compromise: that deputies should endorse the marshal in this post and simultaneously introduce into the Security Council one of the deputies of the Supreme Soviet Chairman, Agafonov. However, deputies did not agree to this compromise. Evidently, the Supreme Soviet will return to this issue in a week."

Continuing his report, Ruvinskiy notes that parliament discussed the recent disbanding of Mikhail Mityukov's Legislation Committee. Deputies said the procedure whereby this was done was faulty: many of those who voted for the disbandment were not in the hall, nor even in Moscow, while some were even outside Russia. This was revealed by the verification of the voting and its results. Some deputies (names unspecified) even protested to the Supreme Soviet against use being made of

their surnames in this way. Ruvinskiy goes on: "However, today the Supreme Soviet decided not to return to this issue. Insistent appeals by people's deputies to have this issue debated were answered by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet with the words that all the same things will not turn out this way, do not waste time in vain, do not interfere, let us carry on normal work."

Currently the Supreme Soviet is debating the candidates for the posts of chairmen of two committees due to be set up in place of Mityukov's disbanded committee, he notes. Russian Unity candidates are prominent here, people like Chelnokov, Isakov, and "some others."

Government Urged To Raise Inflation Estimates

MK2606122693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 26 Jun 93 p 3

[Yegor Medvedev report: "Supreme Soviet Stops Financing Government. Government Will Apparently Have To Adjust Budget"]

[Text] Veniamin Sokolov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic, and Aleksandr Pochinok, chairman of the parliament's planning and budget committee, strongly recommended at a press conference yesterday that the government fine-tune its 1993 budget proceeding from more realistic inflation estimates. Otherwise, the government will be left without money, because it has already spent the funds calculated on the basis of inflation indices that had been set too low.

Problems with regard to the choice of a price level and inflation indices cropped up as early as the fourth quarter of 1992. They were clearly evident in the draft budget for 1993 submitted by the government in January (after one month's delay), which, according to Veniamin Sokolov, contains two methodological errors. First, it was the price level of November 1992 that was adopted as the basis. Second, the budget's calculations were based on the assumption of a 2.5-fold maximum price rise in 1993. In the course of further work on the budget in February-May 1993, these flaws were not corrected, and experts say that the approved budget's level of expenditures was set too low. At the beginning of June, the government effectively reached the limit of expenditures set by the budget. In this situation, the parliament had only two ways to enforce compliance with the budget law—to start sequestering government expenditures in the amount of 8 trillion rubles, or to get the government to present a revised budget.

Veniamin Sokolov and Aleksandr Pochinok are certain that the situation will evolve according to the second scenario. The parliament, in their view, is showing understanding with regard to the financial difficulties encountered by the government. What arouses particular concern, however, is the worsening situation with revenue collection and growing contradictions between the federal budget and local ones. So, in reality, budget revenues are currently being split between the federal budget and local ones in the proportion of 40 percent

and 60 percent respectively instead of the equal distribution provided for by law. As a result, local authorities on the whole have budget surpluses, whereas the Russian Finance Ministry is short of money. A number of republics, for instance Yakutia and Karelia, fail to fulfill their obligations regarding deductions to the federal budget, and Tatarstan and Bashkortostan have halted these payments totally. At the same time, the Finance Ministry has not taken credits from the Central Bank (including investment credits), as it tries to observe the agreement between the government and the Central Bank establishing quarterly ceilings for credit issuance. These "savings" may lead to a new plunge in production and another payment crisis. To avoid an unnecessary sequestering of government expenditures and a "credit crunch," the government was requested that while finalizing the budget it set the level of indexation at 5.6. In Pochinok's view, presenting a budget revised on this basis to the parliament as soon as possible would serve the best interests of the government itself. As for its adoption, those giving the press conference said that this will not pose any problems.

Further on Draft Budget

MK2906100093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 29, 29 Jun 93 (signed to press 28 Jun) p 3

[Dmitriy Volkov report under the "Money" rubric: "Government Has To Present Adjusted Budget to Parliament. Boris Fedorov Shows Stoicism, Maybe Even Too Much"]

[Text] On 30 June the parliament plans to review the revised Russian budget for the current year. This document was submitted by the government to the budget commission last weekend. Numbers in budget items, which have not been adjusted for inflation, make the financing of current federal expenditures more difficult. Mr. Pochinok and Veniamin Sokolov, chairman of the Council of the Republic, said that despite the difficult situation in the parliament, "the deputies will be reasonable enough" to approve the revised budget provided the government presents it on time.

"We are now in expenditure sequestration mode," Mr. Pochinok said. He argued against the government's possible sponsorship of legislation aimed at increasing the budget's revenues by fiscal means, expressing his apprehension that "collecting new taxes will be impossible." At the same time, Aleksandr Pochinok called the government's ambition to reach this goal by "cutting expenditures in the announced amounts" (around 8 trillion rubles) "nearly unachievable."

Mr. Pochinok added that Finance Minister Boris Fedorov was showing "stoicism," as he refused "to take credits from the Central Bank" even in an amount agreed upon in the accord between the bank and the government. The Supreme Soviet's budget commission intends to request that the Finance Ministry "take the entire authorized amount of credits," because, Pochinok

said, "there is no saving any longer." For instance, servicemen have not been paid since April, he said. "He (i.e. Fedorov) has to make urgent payments till the end of the month," Pochinok insisted.

Aleksandr Pochinok expressed cautious optimism regarding Russia's financial situation. He pointed out that some gaps in the federal monetary system have been closed. In particular, leakage of money via the so-called technical credit lines to CIS countries has to be stopped. It is expected that starting 1 July no new "technical credits" will be granted, and debts on old credits will be added by Russia to government debts of the CIS countries.

Khasbulatov Opens Defense Conversion Conference

LD2906091493

[Editorial Report] Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian at 0730 GMT on 29 June carries a report by the station's parliamentary correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy from the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet where a conference of managers of defense industry enterprises undergoing conversion is taking place. The conference was convened "on the personal initiative of the Supreme Soviet chairman, who opened it and who, in his capacity as a professional economist, shared his impressions after visiting a series of such enterprises during recent trips. He said he has the feeling that the management structures do not know what to do now in the conversion sphere, or—as he put it—are deliberately trying to ruin these industries. But, in the Supreme Soviet chairman's view, this is all linked with Russia's place in world politics and is of exceptional importance. In Khasbulatov's opinion, conversion was started with no preparation and is being carried out in an irrational fashion. The departure of highly-trained specialists is currently a big problem."

Ruvinskiy chats before the start of the conference to Valeriy Nikolayevich Sergeyev, deputy chairman of the government Committee for the Food Processing Industry, who believes that the potential released through conversion should be utilized for the needs of the food processing industry.

Says Conversion 'Chaotic'

LD2906185093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1839 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS military writer Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—It is necessary to toughen the responsibility of government officials for "voluntarist decisions on conversion of military plants," Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov told a meeting of defence plant heads at the Russian Parliament today.

The speaker called for the abolition of economic management structures in the staff of the president and the

government, which duplicate the same work. The conversion is "uncontrolled and chaotic," said Khasbulatov and blamed for this mainly executive power structures.

In his opinion, they must demand that the government submit to the congress and the parliament a comprehensive program of conversion to become an element of structural reorganization in Russian basic industries.

In his turn, First Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets, who also attended the meeting, said the draft state conversion program is almost ready and will be soon submitted to the parliament.

The draft includes 14 priority areas, including diversification of enterprises of the Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering, aircraft-building plants, revival of the Russian Fleet, production of medical equipment and communication means.

Conference participants, who represented defence plants from almost all Russian regions, adopted a resolution to recommend the Supreme Soviet to introduce necessary changes in the legislation and adopt laws on the defence order, military-technical cooperation, state service and recruitment training and introduce changes in the 1993 privatization program.

They also demand to put in order the work of banks, boost the development of a long-term program of armaments for 10-15 years with due account of production of materiel for the needs of the Russian Defence Ministry and exports.

Officials Interviewed

LD2906223193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1948 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Feature by commentator Yelena Ozhina on Russian defense industry issues conference, with interviews in the Kremlin with O.N. Soskovets, Russian vice premier, and A.A. Kokoshin, Russian first deputy defense minister; from the "At the Russian Supreme Soviet" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Ozhina] A great deal of work is going on today in the building of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. The chambers—the Soviet of the Republic and the Soviet of Nationalities—are sitting. But apart from that two conferences are taking place which are, in my opinion, very interesting. One of them is taking place in this hall here. [video shows Khasbulatov addressing conference; Ozhina standing on Kremlin stairs]

The heads of defence enterprises have assembled for this conference. They are going to discuss the question of the progress of conversion and the preservation of advanced technologies in enterprises of the defense complex of the Russian Federation. Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, delivered the opening speech at this working conference.

Those invited to this conference include not only the leaders of defense complex enterprises but also members of the government. [addressing Soskovets] What is your assessment of the need to hold this conference and what are the real problems of what we call the military-industrial complex [MIC]?

[Soskovets] I think that this conference is one more method of exchanging opinions which have been expressed by the directors, by the government and in the report which I delivered here. We understand the problems which exist today in the enterprises of the defense complex and in the Defense Ministry. They are quite complicated ones in view of the fact that the processes in the economy are proceeding with some difficulty. I am referring to the transformation of the economy in market conditions. Therefore, I consider that the exchange of opinions which is now taking place at the conference is quite constructive. An understanding of the problems and processes which are taking place in the MIC will allow us to take decisions that will alleviate and improve the prospects of the enterprises, and strengthen rather than destroy the economy.

[Ozhina] The title of the conference speaks about new technologies, about the preservation of advanced technologies but it is also a question of preserving the personnel and preserving the scientific elite which used to work and which still works but which, perhaps, will not work in the future, judging from the article published by Academician Abrikosov in IZVESTIYA. And so, what about cadres and the MIC?

[Soskovets] Any technology is untenable without cadres. So, in the first instance, it is intended to preserve the scientific and production potential of enterprises and scientific organizations. This is a rather difficult task but, nonetheless, it needs to be resolved in these conditions.

[Ozhina, addressing Kokoshin] What is your opinion of the elite cadres which used to work in the MIC which used to have everything—they had money, they had expensive experiments. Now, there is not much money. And so, I repeat the question: What about cadres and the MIC?

[Kokoshin] Well, cadres are needed both to fulfill defense orders and also to organize the large-scale production of hi-tech civilian production. And of course, it is our sacred duty to preserve these cadres. As yet, very little has been done to ensure this. In the past, of course, the situation was far from ideal. It should not be idealized. In fact pay in the defense complex was not much higher than the industrial average. But the provision of resources and the provision of the experimental basis, say, in science and in design bureaus was considerably better than the industrial average.

At present, however, the task is to make really advantageous use of what accumulated there, and not only for

defense orders. The Defense Ministry is vitally interested in ensuring this, because if Russia as a whole has a powerful industry and cadres, then defense orders also will be fulfilled.

[Ozrina] What about opportunities for breaking into the market, the western market, the American market, with the developments and the advanced technologies that exist?

[Soskovets] It is necessary to fight for the market. No one is particularly waiting for us in the market, because the market means, first and foremost, competition. We will try to create a precedent in which our output, our industry, will be competitive.

[Ozrina] Tell me, please, what about the big market and the air show at Le Bourget? The immense possibilities of the aircraft industry have been put on display. Does that allow us into the market, and what are the prospects as far as that is concerned?

[Soskovets] Well, you know, in the market, one will have to elbow partners aside. So the situation is quite difficult. The equipment that today has features that are superior to its foreign counterparts will, of course, be in demand among our partners. I mean the purchasers of our military output. The marketing conditions have to be created with skill.

[Ozrina] The last question: the state order in the military-industrial complex, the correlation between free flight and the state order?

[Soskovets] It is determined by the presence of financial resources.

[Ozrina] What is it like now, roughly?

[Soskovets] It's hard to say.

[Ozrina] It depends on the enterprise?

[Soskovets] Yes, on the enterprise, of course, and on how the Defense Ministry selects its priorities as regards armaments.

[Ozrina] Is the Defense Ministry doing that?

[Kokoshin] Yes, in general, we already have, on the whole, an armaments program up to the year 2000 and beyond for many types of output, and up to 2010. But its adoption is, of course, being delayed by the lack of clarity as regards the economic situation in the country as a whole, since the whole structure and even the armaments system, the armaments program, depends on allocations on which we can count. On the whole, of course, we hope for the retention, at the very least, in the immediate future, of the level of the defense order that exists—in its physical expression, I mean—and for a certain growth in it during the next few years, as soon as the economic situation stabilizes. But what I consider to be absolutely

essential to do in the immediate future is to increase the allocations for research work and for research and development work.

Hearings on 'Dead' Radio, TV Law Draft Viewed

LD2906165793 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Problems relating to radio and television broadcasting were discussed in the Russian Supreme Soviet today, where hearings took place on the law on television and radio broadcasting in the Russian Federation. These were the first hearings to be held since the reorganization of the Committee on the Mass Media. Our correspondent Vyacheslav Osipov reports on the details.

[Osipov] The first thing that strikes one about these hearings is the silence of the new members of the Committee on the Mass Media, of all those who were co-opted under emergency procedure to reinforce the committee's activities; neither Beketov, nor Mushtayev, nor Ilchenko, nor Astafyev displayed any signs of defending the bill. This draft law is indeed dead; its opponents argued their case too well.

In the first place, why is the draft law called "On Television and Radio Broadcasting in the Russian Federation," when 15 of its 36 articles, in one form or another, interpret the concept of licensing and everything connected with that? Those attending the hearings pointed out that a separate law should be drawn up on licensing television and radio channels, and likewise laws on cable television, regional television, commercial television, and wired radio and so on. The bill in question does not mention these at all.

A second aspect which has given rise to sharp criticism: What is a state license holder? And who are these? What is social television, and public television? Why is the latter given tax breaks while state television is not? Why are there so many state television and radio channels in Russia altogether?

Finally, what is state television and radio broadcasting anyway? The bill is littered with terms impermissible for a law, such as "balance of opinions", "ensuring impartiality", "total prerogative of the journalist", and "the impermissibility of monopolies." And who will be defining the terms I have just mentioned? The bill says nothing about that.

Criticisms were also made of those who drew up the law, headed by Vladimir Lisin, chairman of the Mass Media Committee, because many useful provisions in the draft law were taken from the first version, with the words switched around. Many of the authors focussed on the moral tone, ethics, and objectivity of television and radio broadcasting: but, again, they say nothing about what criteria should be used to determine these.

In a word, the draft looks extremely raw, and is oriented toward one political force, and a great deal of lengthy work still needs to be done on it, those taking part in the hearings concluded.

Stepanakov: Immunity Status Should Be Changed

LD2506193793 Moscow *ITAR-TASS in English* 1550 GMT 25 Jun 93

[By *ITAR-TASS* correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—Russia's Prosecutor-General Valentin Stepankov submitted to the Supreme Soviet a legislative initiative on changing the status of the parliamentary immunity of a deputy. He believes that the public prosecutor's office should be granted the right to independently decide upon initiating criminal proceedings against a people's deputy, without obtaining a consent from the corresponding soviet.

Under the current legislation, the prosecutor's office cannot take legal action against a people's deputy and initiate criminal proceedings against him without the consent of the Soviet of People's Deputies.

In his address to the lawmakers, prosecutor-general noted that norms about parliamentary immunity, being intended to protect deputies from any illegal actions, in fact are very often used to help them evade legal responsibility. In Stepankov's opinion, this should be regarded as a considerable infringement upon the rights of citizens, organizations and the state suffered from the crime. This also discredits the principle of legality and hampers successful fight against corruption, a spokesman for the prosecutor-general's office reported.

Defense, Security Body Not To Bow to Pressure

LD2706082493 Moscow *Russian Television Network in Russian* 1900 GMT 26 Jun 93

[Report by announcer Aleksandr Shashkov; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The recent hearings on corruption in the top echelons of state power have also prompted an ambivalent reaction from the Supreme Soviet's committee for defense and security. [Video shows Sergey Stepashin, chairman of Supreme Soviet committee for defense and security.]

[Stepashin] Why is it that today, and particularly in recent weeks, there has been such active and deliberate work under way—and those involved include certain people's deputies and the so-called reform group in the Army—deliberate work to discredit the Armed Forces and the Defense Ministry? No matter who brings up the question of the need for tough confrontation between the parliament and the executive structures, and no matter how the question is brought up, the Supreme Soviet committee for defense and security will never adopt that line.

[Unidentified military official] Some people are unhappy that the force structures [silovyye struktury], including the Armed Forces, are nevertheless following a clearly considered and fully systematized course. In this course we are acting in close interaction with the committee for defense and security.

Deputies Criticize Army Reform Leader, Leave in Protest

MK2506104093 Moscow *NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian* 25 Jun 93 p 2

[Indira Dunayeva report under "Scandal" rubric: "Thirty Deputies Leave Army Reform Group. Many Did Not Know They Were Ever Affiliated With It"]

[Text] Some deputy members of the Army Reform group were outraged by People's Deputy Vitaliy Urazhtsev's political statements made on behalf of the group, especially his idea that the group should organize an election campaign to nominate Aleksandr Rutskoy for Russian president. Deputy Sergey Yushenkov and Vladimir Smirnov, coordinator of the Military for Democracy movement, organized a press conference yesterday where they expressed their position on Army Reform's activity.

Yushenkov said that the deputies who had announced their withdrawal did not like it that "the problems of the Russian Army are being used for speculation aimed at acquiring political capital." In his opinion, the group's activity should be of professional and not of political character: "The group has not addressed real problems of military reform, the problems of creating a professional Army. These problems are paramount today, when at last the Army has been depoliticized and no one will ever succeed in leading it out to the barricades."

Yushenkov said that the group in fact did not exist: Since membership in it may be combined with work in parliamentary factions, many deputies forgot that they are affiliated with this group and therefore have nothing to do with Urazhtsev's statements. "For his part Urazhtsev is acting as though this is not even a group but a political faction."

'Army Reform' Deputies Resign

PM2506090993 Moscow *ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian* 25 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

[Report from roundup of *ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA* and *ITAR-TASS* reports: "Volkogonov Has Left Urazhtsev"]

[Text] Resolute disagreement with the activity of the "Army Reform" deputies' group headed by its leader, Vitaliy Urazhtsev, has been expressed by a number of members of the faction.

In a statement which has been issued under the signature of People's Deputies Dmitriy Volkogonov, Konstantin Kobets, Vasiliy Teterin, Valeriy Ryumin, and Sergey

Yushenkov, its authors have announced their withdrawal from this faction. The document's signatories cited as the motive for their decision their disagreement with Vitaliy Urazhtsev's political statements.

Regional Affairs

New Ossetian Administrators Appointed

LD2906150393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1431 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun—An ITAR-TASS correspondent was told today at the Russian Federation Government press center that in accordance with an order issued by the government on 26 June "On measures for a comprehensive settlement of the problem of refugees and forced migrants in the Ossetian-Ingush conflict zone," Viktor Polyachko has been appointed as the new head of the provisional administration in the state of emergency zone in parts of North Ossetia and Ingushetia with the rank of Russian government deputy prime minister. The same order appoints Major General Nikolay Shentsev as first deputy head of the provisional administration with the rank of deputy minister of internal affairs.

The newly appointed officials will replace Yuriy Shatalin, the present head of the provisional administration, and Major General Vyacheslav Ulybin, his first deputy.

Khanty-Mansiysk Leader on Economic Issues

PM2506140393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Yelena Musatova report under "Interview" rubric: "Northerners Want To Trade Oil and Furs in Europe"]

[Text] On his way home from a business trip abroad Sergey Ivashko, deputy head of the administration of the autonomous Khanty-Mansiysk Okrug for foreign economic activity, addressed journalists at Moscow's International Press Center.

Khanty-Mansiysk, which is part of Tyumen Oblast, is one of the components of the Russian Federation which are dissatisfied with their present status. "To make everyone's rights equal"—this, in S. Ivashko's opinion, would be the wisest decision.

Whether the autonomous okrug is to become an independent state-territorial formation on a par with the other components of the Federation, with all the ensuing consequences, depends on the nature of the new constitution.

Let us start with the fact that 60 percent of Russia's oil, the lion's share of its gas, and also timber, furs, and much else besides are produced on the territory of this region and easily find buyers in nearby foreign parts and further afield. At the same time 77 percent of the profits are paid

into the federal budget, and only 23 percent remain in the local budget. Even this residue, i.e. the revenue side of the budget, amounts to 740 billion rubles—which is three times as much as in such a large republic as Tatarstan, for example. Incidentally, the budgets of the okrug and the oblast have now been separate for two years.

The okrug occupies the same area as Austria, Belgium, Albania, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, and Greece put together. Its problems are no fewer than all of theirs. Money from the budget goes to resolve them.

The okrug leadership does not make it its task, for example, to increase oil extraction, although this has fallen by half compared with the recent past. Let the enterprises themselves tackle economic questions, it is believed here. The funding of priority areas out of a special investment fund is another matter. What are these areas?

There are four: housing construction, health care, ecology, and public law and order.

As regards housing, this problem has existed since oil and gas extraction workers took the first steps to open up Siberia. The tour-of-duty method became the system, when workers are sent in for a short time and they need neither roads, nor houses, nor movie theaters. Temporary workers came and went, not bothered about the ravaged lands, where hardly anything was ever constructed for a more or less tolerable life.

This is attended by the ecological problem. The principle "after us the grass will not grow" has resulted in the fact that, according to ecologists' data, between 20 and 50 kg of oil has been spilled on every square meter of Khanty-Mansiysk land.

Medical centers and hospitals were not constructed for temporary people, not to mention major research centers. Everyone knows that things are far from well with regard to the health of northerners, particularly the indigenous population.

That same tour-of-duty method affected the crime situation in the region. Coming together in the backwoods for a month or two, casuals from over the country behave differently than they do at home, before the eyes of relatives and acquaintances.

These problems have not diminished in recent years. The Union has broken up, it has become inordinately expensive for many people to travel long distances, and so the number of people needing conditions for a normal human existence has not diminished.

Ivashko described in detail how urgent questions are being resolved with the help of Western partners. The French Ministry of the Interior, for example, is delivering special equipment and motor transport adapted to the region's conditions for the militia's road patrol and

operational investigation services. It is planned to construct a modern medical center in Khanty-Mansiysk, and eight foreign firms are working on the plans for it on a competitive basis. Currency funds are being spent on acquiring portable ultrasound systems for "first aid" and purchasing abroad sophisticated dental equipment and medicines which are in very short supply. Large Western firms are involved in geological research. As the result of a recent trip to Italy work will be continued on the creation of a modern communications system in Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug. Four international telephone exchanges are already operating.

So it is possible to cope with our problems, Ivashko believes.

"Apparently, the federal government has recently been pursuing an active regional policy," he said. "But, in my view, this is more like a political game today for the purpose of attracting more supporters. The Khant have a saying: 'The taiga makes a noise overhead, while down below all is quiet.' So it is here."

The Russian Supreme Soviet has long been discussing a draft law on the Khanty-Mansiysk National Okrug. If it is, at last, adopted, then...

It could prompt other autonomous okrugs to take corresponding actions. The draft law proposes leaving no less than 50 percent of the income—instead of the present 23 percent—in the okrug's own budget. So that, for the time being, the taiga makes a noise overhead....

Tatarstan President Comments on Economy *LD2606094393*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1420 GMT on 25 June presents the "Yevraziya" program entitled "Tatarstan: Sabantuy in the Rain" on the Tatar national holiday to mark the end of spring fieldwork. Against a background of rain-soaked festivities, correspondent Kim Gerasimov looks at today's Tatarstan, where, Gerasimov notes, 49 percent of the inhabitants are Tatars, 43 percent are Russians, and the remainder are representatives of the other peoples of the former USSR. Gerasimov notes that Tatarstan proclaimed itself a sovereign state in association with Russia.

The program then carries a clip of a recorded interview with Mintimer Shaymiyev, president of the Republic of Tatarstan, in his office with the republican flag off to the side. He says:

"As for the immediate state of the economy, like the whole of Russia and the CIS, we are also suffering a slump, but to a lesser degree. We are nevertheless having success in the leading branches of the national economy, even including defense enterprises. We are currently mastering civilian production everywhere, and it is starting to bring in revenue for the Republic's budget.

Our way of moving into the market is somewhat different: Starting from 1992, we chose the road of a so-called soft entry into the market, which has wholly justified itself. We did not permit the population to be impoverished, and today earnings exceed the population's spending, however you calculate it, whether by consumer basket or minimum budget."

Over video of oil fields and installations, described as "the economic basis of the Republic's sovereignty," President Shaymiyev continues:

"The process of establishing statehood is under way, and we are working on this consistently. As you know, a year ago a referendum was held in Tatarstan on the question of Tatarstan obtaining state status, and the absolute majority of the population, regardless of nationality, responded in the affirmative to the question. This was the basis for constituting relations with Russia: Tatarstan already has its new constitution, which was also adopted in a stable atmosphere."

Over video of Kazan, with its Russian Orthodox churches and mosques, Gerasimov recalls the events of the winter of 1990, when demonstrators were in the streets, and the grand triumph of the World Congress of Tatars, which Kazan hosted. Shaymiyev mentions briefly the great success of the recent children's cultural festival, in which children of all nationalities took part.

Further aerial views show Tatarstan's oil fields and the town of Almeyevsk, from where the Druzhba oil pipeline flows to Europe, and beneath which, Gerasimov notes, "lies the greater part of the 90 million tonnes of oil which make up the surveyed reserves of oil in the Republic. Extraction began to decline in the 1970's, because the easily accessible strata were worked out. Now, however, it has stabilized. Due to the changes in recent years, the Republic's real income from oil extraction has gone up."

Gerasimov points out that oil revenues are finally reaching the rural areas. Ardinat Nugaybekov, identified by caption as head of the Yelkhovneft administration, says in an interview that in 1991 Yelkhovneft started to invest in agriculture, purchasing combine harvesters, and build houses and a new mosque in the village.

Regarding the situation of non-Tatars in the Republic, Tatarstan People's Deputy Aleksey Kolesnik says there are no major infringements on civil rights in the Republic. As an illustration, the Yamashneft administration, headed by Viktor Smykov, is currently reviving the old Russian village of Yamashi. Swiss equipment has been purchased for a highly successful bakery, and there is a dairy which also has imported equipment. The Orthodox Church in the village is also being restored, the program notes.

In an interview given to correspondent Viktor Samarin at an unspecified location, Yuriy Yarov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, says that during a recent visit to Tatarstan he

discussed the question of ownership of property and the hugely damaging fire at the Kamaz works. Tatarstan clearly needs assistance from Russia to alleviate the problems created for the works and its labor force, and it must measure its possibilities against its obligations, he says.

The program then cuts back to the interview with Shaymiyev, who says:

"Regarding the powers handed over, Russia's Constitution will operate on the territory of Tatarstan. This is a very important factor. These will be treaty-based and constitutional relations. The powers will partly be handed over and delegated to Russia. Some issues will be under joint jurisdiction. One should take a perfectly calm view of this; since this is a voluntary handing over of powers, it will be quite the strongest possible union."

The program then carries a clip of a demonstration by Zaki Zaynullin, president of the Mardzhani Society, who is planning a hunger strike in defense of Agliullin, the imprisoned chairman of the All-Tatar Public Center. In the clip placards demanding that Tatarstan people's deputies should be returned from the Constitutional Conference can be seen. Marat Kulyukov, honorary president of the All-Tatar Public Center, says that the grounds for Agliullin's arrest are unsubstantiated and demands that the law should be applied to him in the same way as to others.

Gerasimov then asks President Shaymiyev whether he expects any real threat to peace and tranquillity in Tatarstan from extremist forces. Shaymiyev says: "Attempts are indeed being made by extremist forces, both nationalist and—as they describe themselves—right-wing Russian [pravorossiyskiy] and such radicals. But I believe that they have no real basis for weakening the state structure and order in Tatarstan."

After the end of the program, attributed to the "Yevraziya" studio 1993, and the credits, which give thanks to the "Tatarstan" Television company, Gerasimov adds the following for viewers: "Events took an unusual turn after this program was ready to go on the air. Tatarstan decided to recall its delegation from the Constitutional Conference in Moscow, alleging that its legitimate interests were being disregarded there, namely its proposal on treaty relations with Russia. Of course, every participant in negotiations is free to interpret them in his own way, and yet one should not overdramatize the situation: What I have seen and heard in Tatarstan compels me to think that a mutually acceptable means will be found to secure common interests. In the final analysis, political life is by no means a sabantuy, but far more complex."

Kuban Cossack Leader Assails Local Authorities

PM2806093193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 93 First Edition p 5

[By Andrey Aderekhin: "Hetman Anikin Flew Into a Rage"]

[Text] Krasnodar—Addressing Cossacks, A. Anikin, hetman of the Yekaterinodar Detachment of the All-Kuban Cossack Host, declared that power in the Kuban is exercised without the Cossacks and regardless of them, and so the Yekaterinodar Detachment is embarking on resolute actions.

Every hetman will receive a list of deputies, after which representatives of the rayon organizations, or kurens, will meet with the deputies to ascertain their positions. Anikin warned: "If deputies refuse to cooperate with the Cossacks, they will be instructed to surrender their mandate. We will not enter a game on cardsharp rules—with a recall of deputies..."

After dealing with the deputies, the hetman went on to the administration and reported: "We have drawn up a list of measures, including very resolute measures, to influence the administration, and they will be put into practice consistently." "Lacking the people's mandate to manage and appointed for who knows what services, the administrators are criminally squandering our land, stooping to making all sorts of gifts. For these actions they will at some time appear before a Cossack court... Having taken the land from us, the enemies will take everything. It is simplest of all to do this in the form of private land ownership."

After emphasizing the need to return to the Cossacks without delay all the property that belonged to them as of 1 January 1917, the hetman went on to nationalities questions.

Anikin's position is this—all who were born in republics which have proclaimed themselves sovereign must return to their motherland. The hetman emphasized: "We consider it expedient to begin preparing for the compulsory exchange of apartments abandoned by Russian refugees in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Chechnya, and other republics with citizens of these sovereign states resident in the Kuban."

To conclude the speech, which has been published in the newspaper KUBANSKIY KURYER, Hetman Anikin reported that the sole criterion for assessing any actions or documents is their conformity with the Cossacks' national interests. Therefore any drafts of constitutions which do not provide for the Cossacks' national interests and recognize the Cossack hosts as components of the Federation must be rejected.

Melnikov Named Yeltsin Representative in Chita Oblast

PM2906154193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

[“Appointment” report]

[Text] By edict of the Russian Federation president Vladimir Ilich Melnikov has been appointed the Russian Federation president's representative in Chita Oblast.

Defense Ministry Group Leaves for North Caucasian MD*LD2806104593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1000 GMT 28 Jun 93*

[ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—A group of generals and officers of the Russian Federation Defense Ministry led by Colonel General Boris Gromov, deputy defense minister, left today for the troops of the North-Caucasian Military District in connection with the summer period of training, which starts on 1 July. During the trip the group will visit a number of military units and formations and will assist the command in organizing the training process, the ITAR-TASS correspondent learned at the Russian Federation Defense Ministry Press Center.

Peacekeeping Efforts in North Caucasus Summarized*MK2906130093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 3*

[Natalya Pachegina report: "Public Opinion as Reconciliation Method. North Ossetia and Ingushetia Have Been Reminded That They Depend on Moscow"]

[Text] It looks like the federal authority's skillful (at least on the face of it) tactics in resolving the Ossetian-Ingush conflict may excuse, for some time at least, its lack of strategic program in regard to the North Caucasus region. One such tactical success could be the Ossetian-Ingush conflict "roundtable" composed of representatives of national movements and public organizations of the North Caucasus held in Pyatigorsk on 25 June. Also participating were the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet State Committee for Affairs of the Federation and Nationalities, and the "Senezhskiy Forum." The use made of the reverberations sent by the State Committee for the Federation's 20 June statement was perhaps the first show of real statesmanship here. This was confirmed by the address made at the "roundtable" by Sergey Shakhrai, vice premier of the Russian Federation Government and chairman of the State Committee for the Federation. He briefed participants in the gathering about a decree drawn up in the Russian Government on ending the aftermath of the armed conflict between North Ossetia and Ingushetia. The decree signed by the leaders of both republics confirms continued adherence to the principles of the Kislovodsk accords and envisions a stage by stage return of refugees to their homes. The document, which is ready for publication, provides for changes within the Temporary Administration in the limited zone where an emergency situation is in force. Now the Temporary Administration will be led by a deputy government chairman, who will also head a mixed commission whose functions will be to determine the sites to be settled by refugees and forced migrants and the sequence and time frames for the settlement. The administration will have proportionately staffed

headquarters in the capitals of both republics. Monthly reports by the Temporary Administration head to the government, provided for in the decree, are supposed to help keep tabs on the observance by both sides of the Kislovodsk accords, and on how money from the state budget (8 billion rubles) meant for the construction and rebuilding of housing in the emergency situation zone is used. While Sergey Shakhrai spent a short time at the "roundtable" conference, his presence there is likely to have a long-term effect—the vice premier reminded participants that both republics in the conflict continue to be subsidized from Moscow, hence they were not free to be unconcerned about the impression they project with the Kremlin.

The moderator of the "roundtable" in Pyatigorsk, Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian Federation Soviet of the Nationalities, who graphically demonstrated the advantages of a smooth operation of the executive and legislative branches tandem, succeeded, it seems, in the most important thing—in shifting the problems of overcoming the consequences of the armed conflict into the realm of protection of human rights. It is his sometimes explosive remarks (had they been uttered by "a person of non-Caucasian nationality" they would have drawn protest) that shaped public opinion among the delegations of Adygeya, Dagestan, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia, Rostov, Krasnodar, and Stavropol Oblasts [as published—Rostov is an oblast; Krasnodar and Stavropol are krais] of Russia, and public organizations of all-Russia and regional importance. Although the peacemakers' admonitions were more than mild (they are always in the Caucasus)—that is, they were limited mainly to offers of mediation—both the Ossetian and Ingush delegations seem to have perceived and passed on the message: In matters of war and peace in the North Caucasus, their neighbors side with the "center." The peacemaking mission created on the Pyatigorsk "roundtable" decision (in addition to the already existing mediators of Dagestan and Stavropol Krai), to be made up of representatives of the Confederation of Repressed Peoples, the "Senezhskiy Forum," "volunteers" from national and public organizations, of various faiths of the North Caucasus and Moscow, intends, as is said in the "table's" statement, "to constructively foster reconciliation of the sides in conflict."

Tyumen Oil Industry Problems Reported*PM2806110893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Jun 93*

[By Ivan Pankov from Tyumen Oblast; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Pankov] In June alone the oil workers have already twice reduced extraction. They believe that unless the situation changes then the sector will very soon be paralyzed and this in a situation in which there is a shortage of gasoline and aviation fuel. Fuel oil used by electric power stations has not been shipped to the north or other regions for the next winter. At the gas

pumps with every new price increase people believe that the oil workers gain from it, demanding a large wage for themselves. Is that the case? It turns out that the oil workers can hardly make ends meet and so far they have seen no influx of money in exchange for oil.

[V. Ott, president of the Rossiyskaya Neft state association] In principle today we often supply plants without preliminary payment since both the plants and our association today find themselves in a situation in which for finished output which they supply they are owed a huge amount of money. As of 1 June we had collected all information: the debts of the petroleum refineries of Russia and the CIS countries were already in excess of 800 billion rubles.

[Pankov] This system operates following a government directive: If the oil workers this year fail to supply oil free of charge then the sowing in Russia would come to a standstill, the movement of trains would be curtailed, and much else. So that all this today is being paid for from the very meager pockets of the people who extract oil. Many consumers of petroleum products today are poor: They cannot afford the prices and that has led to the point where after the petroleum has been refined at the refinery they take gasoline, kerosene, and solar oil, although less than they need, but do not take fuel oil. And the reservoirs of the Russian refineries are filled to overflowing with fuel oil and for that reason cannot take new consignments of oil. What is the way out?

[Ott] The oil workers must be given permission to find solvent customers either in Russia or failing that in the CIS countries or abroad.

[Pankov] Otherwise the oil industry will slide downhill.

Magadan Oblast To Sell Gold at London Exchange

MK2806124093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 29, 29 Jun 93 (Signed to Press 28 Jun) p 3

[POSTFACTUM report: "Chernomyrdin Allows Magadan Oblast To Sell Gold Reserve At London Exchange"]

[Text] Viktor Chernomyrdin, Russian Federation Council of Ministers chairman, has sent an order to Magadan Oblast administration allowing it to sell 2,500 kg of gold produced in the oblast at the London International Exchange. According to the press center of the oblast administration, earnings from the sale will be invested in the modernization of the Dukat enrichment combine, in the second phase of a construction project to build Russia's largest gold and silver-containing ore processing factory in Kolyma, and also in the authorized capital of a new business designed to engage in the development of the Kubakskoye gold and silver deposit.

Unofficial sources emphasize that the money will be deposited in an Austrian bank in order for Magadan to be able to receive large credits from EC countries.

International Affairs

Zlenko Criticizes U.S. Attack on Iraq

LD2906200593 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Statement by Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko on U.S. action against Iraq, delivered at Ukrainian Supreme Council session—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed people's deputies. On Sunday, 27 June, the mass media reported a strike by American missiles on the Iraqi intelligence center in Baghdad. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine did not have advance information about the preparation of this action by the United States. We found out about it from radio and television. Immediately after getting this information, an operational group of employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine was assembled in order to ascertain the details of the attack. The group was in contact with the permanent mission of Ukraine at the United Nations, Ukraine's Embassy in the United States, and the U.S. Embassy in Kiev.

I ask you not to forget that this was Sunday and it was quite difficult to get full information, even through official channels. In spite of certain difficulties, the chief elements of the U.S. aggression, the U.S. action, were ascertained by efficient means. Proceeding from this information, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs prepared a statement for the mass media, which noted that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine expressed regret on the matter of the bombardment of Baghdad by American missiles, which caused casualties among the peaceful population.

It is difficult to say, the statement continued, how much this action accords with the decisions of the UN Security Council, but it reminds us once again that all nations and peoples should respect the universally acknowledged principles and norms of civilized coexistence. The statement said, however, that it is regrettable that dangerous new conflicts are added to dangerous unsettled conflicts, causing suffering among peaceful people who are not guilty of anything.

This statement was handed over to the information program of Ukrainian Television-1 on the same day, and broadcast on domestic and external radio. Ukrainian Radio and Ukrainian Radio World Service repeated this report. This statement was made known to the American side.

On Monday, 28 June, the deputy head of the U.S. diplomatic mission in Ukraine was invited to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine regarding this matter. Information about our reaction to the American attack on Baghdad was made known to him. In addition the representative of the U.S. Embassy was asked about the motives and juridical grounds for the U.S. action, the technical means of carrying it out, the results, and the exact number of victims among the civilian population.

The deputy head of the U.S. diplomatic mission in Ukraine reported that the attack was carried out at the decision of President Clinton as an action to restrain the regime of Saddam Husayn with the purpose of warning him against implementing a policy of state terrorism. According to the information [words indistinct] the U.S. state bodies were precisely informed that the attempt on the life of former President George Bush while he was in Kuwait on 14 April was planned by Iranian [as heard] intelligence.

The Americans handed over to us written materials, which contain proof of the attempt on former President Bush and statements by U.S. officials setting forth the U.S. position. [passage omitted]

So esteemed deputies, the main U.S. argument is that the United States acted in accordance with article 51 of the UN Charter, which allows states to implement the right to individual and collective self-defense. We have carefully analyzed article 51 of the UN Charter and come to the conclusion that the arguments of the U.S. administration diverge significantly from the clauses of this article.

Incidentally, the article says, I quote: This Charter in no way—that is, the UN Charter—affects the inalienable right to individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs on a member of the organization, that is the UN Organization, until such time as the Security Council takes necessary measures to maintain international peace and security.

Well, as you see, there was no armed attack. The threat of aggression was absent. There also seems not to have been a threat to the territorial integrity and independence of the United States. The attack was naturally made without the agreement of the UN Security Council, as Article 51 says, which namely calls and stresses that when employing such actions there should be consultations at the UN Security Council.

If this issue, namely the preparation of an attempt on the life of former President Bush, is to be examined in accordance with the norms of international law, then I ought to mention that in 1973 the UN General Assembly adopted a special convention on preventing and punishing crimes against persons under international protection. This convention, to which more than 65 countries are parties, including the United States and Iraq, emphasizes that such crimes create a serious threat to maintaining normal international relations, which are necessary for cooperation between states. This convention contains special clauses on the mechanisms for ensuring its implementation. These mechanisms incidentally, allow the sides to resolve conflict issues by legal means, not resorting naturally to means of force.

As President Clinton stated, an attempt on an American President, even a former one, is a hostile act against the American people, and the criminal must be punished. The Americans drew special attention to the fact that the

time of the attack, approximately 0100, was chosen on purpose in order to keep casualties to the minimum.

The main purpose of the attack was the center, I am reading now, of Iraqi intelligence in Baghdad; 16 missiles out of 23 hit the center exactly. Four landed alongside the center, and three deviated from the target somewhat, striking dwellings and causing casualties. The United States, as their official representatives stated, deeply regrets this. [passage omitted]

I ought to say that the political and juridical analysis carried out by specialists of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the U.S. action shows that the missile attack on Baghdad can be described as a somewhat excessive measure, which goes beyond the limits of requisite sufficiency, which states may employ in the campaign against terrorism.

Although it is entirely evident that the attempt on the life of former President Bush can be described as an act of state terrorism, which is an international crime according to international law, an attempt to kill a person under international protection is not an act of aggression and consequently, the U.S. reprisals against Iraq raise very many questions.

The most unpleasant thing in this context is naturally the presence of casualties among the civilian population. We firmly insist on the position that even for the sake of punishing international criminals, it is inadmissible to endanger the lives of peaceful residents. In addition this precedent could have negative consequences. First, the reaction of the Arab world will hardly add positive (?features) to U.S. foreign policy and will hardly improve the settlement of problems in this dangerously explosive region.

Second, such a precedent could also be used by other states, in whose policies can be perceived attempts to play a leading policing role in certain of the world's regions, as grounds for justifying actions contradicting the universally acknowledged norms of the civilized coexistence of states.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine is continuing work on monitoring the situation and analyzing the actions of the United States and is studying the information arriving from Ukraine's embassies and missions abroad. Thank you for your attention.

Official Says Attack Not 'Appropriate'

LD2906185793 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] If the U.S. missile attack on Baghdad had taken place one day earlier, no one knows what the outcome of the world conference on human rights would have been, Oleksandr Chalyy, head of the contractual and legal department of the Foreign Ministry of Ukraine, said today at a briefing held at the Foreign Ministry. In his opinion, the bombing is not an appropriate U.S. reply to

the terrorist attempt against former President George Bush, the more so since a lengthy period of time elapsed between these two events.

The world conference in Vienna, which was attended by a Ukrainian delegation, signed a declaration. It was pointed out at the briefing that this political document is based on the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Human Rights. It finally confirms women's rights as well as the rights and obligations of national minorities.

The briefing also announced a new visa regime in Ukraine. Its purpose, as Petro Sardachuk, chief of the consular department of the Foreign Ministry, pointed out, is to bring at least the basic elements of order to entry in and exit from Ukraine.

Cabinet Denies Report of Nuclear Arms Agreement With Russia

LD2906221593 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] The Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers' press service today refuted an article published in the Moscow-based IZVESTIYA newspaper under the headline, "Kiev and Moscow Agree on Fate of Nuclear Weapons Stationed in Ukraine." The author of this publication wrote, for the sake of sensation, that on 28 June, Leonid Kuchma and Viktor Chernomyrdin, the heads of the governments of Ukraine and Russia, were to sign an agreement concerning nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory.

The press service has been authorized to declare that during the conference of the leaders of the border oblasts of Ukraine and Russia in Kharkov, with the participation of the heads of state of both countries, this question was merely discussed. However, no document is ready to be signed. At the same time, the Ukrainian press service statement says the issue of nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory is being tackled and will be solved in the interests of not only Ukraine but the entire world.

Crimean Leader Opposes Black Sea Fleet Division

WS2906115793 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 23 Jun 93 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Mykola Bagrov: 'I Am Against the Fleet's Division'"]

[Text] Mykola Bagrov, speaker of the Crimean Supreme Soviet, held a news conference on the results of the Yeltsin-Kravchuk meeting devoted to the situation in the Black Sea Fleet. He communicated that the Ukrainian and Russian Navies will share the Sevastopol Naval Base. "Just as I insisted," stressed M. Bagrov, "the year 1995 remained intact as the final term for the transition period, as stipulated by the Yalta Agreement."

The Crimean legislative speaker noted that Sevastopol is an inalienable part of the Crimean Republic, and it is the Crimean citizens that can alter its status. Proposals put

forth by Sevastopol residents and the Crimean Supreme Soviet must be taken into account. He said he was slightly disappointed by the presidents' decision to divide the fleet: "Why am I so staunchly opposed to the division? You can divide vessels and servicemen, but how can you possibly divide the surveillance system, which took decades to develop? This is impossible. In addition, the military presence in the Black and Mediterranean Seas is growing. At this point, the Black Sea Fleet should be preserved as a single military unit."

Asked if Ukraine would build ships for the Russian Fleet, M. Bagrov said: "I am optimistic about this."

Sevastopol Graduates Go to Russian, Ukrainian Navies

WS2906122493 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 23 Jun 93 p 4

[Unattributed report from the "Communicated to the Issue" column]

[Text] A graduation ceremony was held at the Sevastopol Naval Institute. First officer shoulder straps and daggers were presented to the graduating lieutenants of the Ukrainian and Russian Armed Forces by Rear Admiral Viktor Makarov, head of the institute; Major General Yuriy Prokofyev, head of the Main Administration of Military Education at the Ukrainian Defense Ministry; Vice Admiral Borys Kozhin, commander in chief of the Ukrainian Navy; and Vice Admiral Vitaliy Larionov, deputy commander of the Black Sea fleet. There will be 239 graduates in the Ukrainian Navy and 7 in other military branches of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, while 372 cadets will go to the Russian Navy and one to the Moldovan Armed Forces. At their request, 88 individuals were transferred to the reserve. Of these, 60 expressed their desire to work in the Ukrainian nuclear power engineering field.

Kravchuk, Slovak President Sign Treaty

LD2906214793 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in English 2100 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Slovakia's president and President Kravchuk of Ukraine signed a treaty on good-neighborliness, friendly relations, and cooperation between the two countries at the close of the first day of Slovak President Kovac's two-day official visit to Ukraine.

On the same day, President Kovac met with President Kravchuk, Verkhovna Rada Chairman Ivan Plyushch, Foreign Minister Zlenko, and Defense Minister Morozov.

During Kovac's meetings with the Ukrainian parliament speaker the two countries' bilateral relations were discussed including those on the parliament level, the Slovak president informed Ivan Plyushch about processes under way in Slovakia and Czechia. The Verkhovna Rada chairman commented, at his guest's request,

on the recently passed decision to conduct a nationwide referendum in September. The two officials also discussed the issue of ethnic minorities and agreed that it was mandatory to afford ethnic minorities equal rights, with the aboriginal population [word indistinct].

French Consortium To Aid in Chernobyl Project

WS3006102693 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1603 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Kiev, 29 June—A briefing was held at the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry that addressed a broad range of issues.

Volodymyr Kalosha, deputy minister of the population's protection against the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, provided an update on the "Ukryttya [shelter]" tender competition intended to select the best projects on the "Sarcophagus." His report was prompted by misrepresentation of the facts on the part of some media. According to Volodymyr Kalosha, the competition was divided into three stages: 19 tenders qualified for the second stage, and only 8 for the third one. The secret ballot showed that no project met all of the requirements of the competition. However, it was decided to consider the "Resolution" project, developed by a consortium of Ukrainian-French companies, a winner of the tender process. This project envisions construction of the Ukryttya-2 and dismantling the Ukryttya-1.

National Affairs

START Working Group Holds Discussions

LD2906140293 Kiev UKRINFORM in Ukrainian 1656 GMT 26 Jun 93

[Text] The deputies' working group for the study of issues regarding the ratification of the START Treaty by the Supreme Council of Ukraine and Ukraine's adoption of a non-nuclear status held a routine session on 28 June chaired by V. V. Durdynets, first deputy chairman of Ukraine's Supreme Council, with the participation of a number of ministry and department heads.

People's deputies heard reports and had a thorough discussion of the issues concerning the definition of limits and restrictions on strategic offensive arms in connection with the preparation for the ratification of the START I Treaty, and a comprehensive program of measures for the elimination of strategic offensive arms in Ukraine. Also at issue were possible methods of economic and financial provision for the treaty and the environmental safety of operations on nuclear arms elimination.

Parliamentary Deputy Chairman Hrynyov Resigns

LD2906161593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1558 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Kiev June 29 TASS - Today's plenary session of the Ukrainian Parliament accepted the resignation of its deputy chairman Volodymyr Hrynyov.

Hrynyov offered his resignation a few days before, accounting for his decision by the fact that he could not hold that post for moral considerations.

Supreme Council Accepts Resignation

LD3006094693 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0500 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] The present Supreme Council session will last until the end of September. This decision was made at a plenary session of this highest legislative body of Ukraine on 29 June. At the same time, it was decided that the parliament's plenary sessions will be convened by the Supreme Council Presidium in July and September to consider urgent socioeconomic and political issues. During this period, the Presidium and the deputies' standing commissions will be working according to a separate plan. On the same day, 29 June, the Supreme Council satisfied Volodymyr Hrynyov's request to relieve him of his duties as deputy chairman of the parliament.

Situation at Zaporozhye Nuclear Plant Viewed

LD2906200893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2002 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Vladimir Yeremenko for TASS]

[Text] Energodar, the Zaporozhye region, June 29 TASS—Incorrect interpretation by some correspondents of operative information recorded by the plant duty officer was the reason for panic around the situation on the third unit of the Zaporozhye nuclear power plant.

A regular inspection of the protection system switched off the power unit due to a malfunction in a unit's block. The block was replaced, the equipment tested and the power unit was switched on at 8:11 on Tuesday.

In accordance with the international nuclear accident scale, the third unit's situation is estimated at the null degree, since no limits or the safety rules were broken. Any atmospheric discharges were out of the question as well.

Sources at the plant information center told UKRINFORM, the situation at the plant is normal, the fifth power unit is under regular repairs and the other four function in the usual regime. The radiation situation does not exceed regular background indices.

Pervomaysk, Krasnodon Continue Strikes, Add Demands

LD2906194093 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Today all the mines of the Stakhanov coal association resumed work following negotiations. The oblast state administration press service reports that the Pervomaysk and Krasnodon coal associations are continuing to strike. Another rally is under way in Krasnodon today. Its participants added new demands to the previous ones, now of a regional nature.

Import Duties Lifted on Some Commodities

LD2906163993 Kiev UKRINFORM in Ukrainian 1656 GMT 28 Jun 93

[Text] The Cabinet of Ministers has ruled to lift import duties on a considerable number of commodities in (?1993), with the aim of encouraging the supply of certain types of commodities to Ukraine. Specifically, these are live animals, planting materials (seeds), oil-seed meals, oil and oil products, a number of chemical industry products, particularly those necessary for the production of fertilizers, means of plant protection, medical equipment, paper and cardboard, fabrics, non-ferrous metals, etc.

The Ministry of Finance and the State Customs Committee have been put in charge of monitoring the implementation of this resolution.

Communist Forces Unite, Seek To Restore Soviet Power

MK2906095093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 93 p 3

[Vladimir Skachko report under "Ukraine" rubric: "Fighting for Soviet Power Again. Post-Communist Opposition Unites in Kiev"]

[Text] The unification of the post-communist opposition, the need for which had so long been aired by sociopolitical organizations and political parties of this orientation at the end of last winter and the beginning of spring, did not come about until this summer. On 26 June in Kiev a foundation congress was held of a new sociopolitical association, Working Ukraine [WU]. Its founders are the Ukrainian Socialist Party, the Ukrainian Workers Front, and the Ukrainian Communists Union movement. The congress, attended by 134 delegates from 23 oblasts and the republic of Crimea, adopted two documents—a declaration on the creation of WU and its charter. At the forum Ukrainian People's Deputy Yevgeniy Marmazov, a secretary of the recently restored Ukrainian Communist Party, announced his intention to join the WU. Taking part in the congress were 12 people's deputies at all levels, including three people's deputies of Ukraine.

The congress motto apparently was "No debates," owing to which it lasted merely from 1100 until 1600 and was marked by amazing unanimity and determination for decisive action. At the very start the tone was set by Petr Zavernivovk, who stated: "The time has come for simple words and simple actions. We need no profound discussions about fine political subtleties." According to Zavernivovk, in a situation where "Kiev will soon become a Munich, just as Lvov is already becoming one," it is necessary to act and take to the streets.

The declaration proclaims power of the working people as the WU's main goal. To achieve it WU members intend to act along three lines. First, win the September referendum on confidence in the Supreme Soviet and the Ukrainian president, which should result in the abolition of the presidency and the establishment of people's power in the form of soviets. Ukrainian socialist leader Aleksandr Moroz stated that WU must not allow early elections of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, since this would lead to the disintegration of the state. Second, election of a future Supreme Soviet, which WU must win. Many speakers stressed that WU should become not only a political forum of leftist forces but develop as "a movement of people's labor unity." Third, the new constitution, which according to the WU congress, should enshrine people's power and prevent a change in the sociopolitical system, a replacement of socialism by capitalism. The organization intends to act on the basis of four fundamental principles: social justice, democracy, patriotism, and internationalism.

In contrast to its predecessors, the association's main principle is voluntary and legitimate membership. WU's charter says that it is a voluntary all-Ukrainian association "whose aim is to coordinate the activities of its members." In the opinion of the congress delegates, unification of post-communist and socialist organizations within WU is proceeding both at the grass-roots level and at the top. It is a genuine manifestation of working people's initiative that in virtually every oblast public associations are emerging in whose names the adjective "working" is dominant. And this is really so since already there are Working Kharkov, Working Kiev, Working Cherkasshchina, and so forth.

Even the new organization's political opponents admit that the socioeconomic situation in the country, which is characterized by deteriorating living standards, provides fertile soil for WU activities.

WU members have approved as the organization's official banner the former (blue-and-white) flag of the Ukrainian SSR since they have proclaimed as their main political and state task the restoration of the Ukrainian SSR and Soviet power. And so as not to tempt the people with new economic trends, some proposed that the words "private farmer," "privatization," "market," and many others be excluded from Ukrainian. These proposals drew applause in the hall, and pledges were given

in front of the blue-and-white flag to die [fighting for their cause]—but for some reason the Internationale was not sung.

Communist Party Leaders Condemn Kravchuk

PM2906151393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jun 93 p 2

[Interviews with Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretaries Petr Simonenko, Leonid Grach, Aleksandr Kotsyuba, Vitaliy Lutsenko, and Yevgeniy Marmazov, conducted by Viktor Drozd; place and not given: "'We Will Rise Again, But Not From the Ashes'—So Say the Leaders of the Communist Party of Ukraine"]

[Text] The restorative congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine [CPU] has been held in Donetsk. The Rules, Programmatic Statement, and Declaration of the Resumption of Activity of the Communist Party of Ukraine were adopted. The congress supported the strikers' demands and expressed its opinion on relations between the CPU and the CPSU. Leadership organs were set up. Petr Simonenko was elected first secretary of the central committee. How do the central committee secretaries regard the work done, and what do they see as the immediate tasks?

[Simonenko] The main result is the restoration of a single Communist Party of Ukraine. There was no special discussion of whether we should regard ourselves as the successors of the Communist Party of Ukraine illegally banned after August 1991 or lay the foundations of a new political organization. We are continuers of the cause of the communists of Ukraine. At the same time we remain consistent internationalists. We therefore consider it perfectly natural to coordinate our actions with all the communist parties of CIS countries. At the next central committee plenum we will decide who will represent the CPU and will agree to the forms and the content of CPU-CPSU cooperation. I would specially like to stress that the delegates condemned the attempts of those who seek to arrogate the right to represent the CPU anywhere. They do not have the authority to do this, and by persisting in their intentions they are harming the cause.

[Grach] The complexity of the congress's work resided in the fact that delegates were able to see for themselves the destructiveness of the stances and intentions of those who have essentially been bent on causing a split while in general hiding behind correct appeals. These plans were not realized. Commonsense prevailed: It is now most important of all that we unite. The idea of creating and preserving continuity prevailed over building something new. The cause prevailed—rather than the cult of someone's services, and dubious ones at that.

In the opinion of the Crimean delegates, the basis of a more intelligent understanding of party democracy and organizational building has been laid in the CPU, which makes it possible to talk about a party undergoing

renewal—evidence of which is supplied by the Crimean party organization's joining the CPU as a collective member.

[Kotsyuba] The congress resolutely advocated the maintenance and strengthening of the power of the soviets as the most effective form of people's power. Therefore an attack on the soviets like the president's blatant attempt to push them aside by means of the administrations created by him was seen as an attempt to compromise the soviets and thereby argue that they are redundant.

The extent of the unity between the president and the national democrats in their vain attempts did not go unnoticed by the delegates either. The national democrats, incidentally, immediately announced their support for Leonid Kravchuk's latest anticonstitutional attempt to take all executive power into his own hands. But what does the law matter to the president of a rule-of-law state in cahoots with "democrats" when power is at stake? Here, one supposes, all means are justified.

The worth of Kravchuk's statements that the people are the sole source of power has already been learned by the delegates of the recent congress of kolkhoz workers, and the strikers, whose demands have been exploited by the president to strengthen his personal power.

The attitude to people's power is eloquently indicated by the fact that the congress of representatives of soviets is postponed on every pretext. And yet that is where the bases of the state system and the new draft constitution must be discussed.

The president is afraid of the people because his authority is rapidly waning.

[Lutsenko] The national democrats' policy is suffering failure. That is already clear. Their leaders realize that the CPU will seek to rally all genuinely democratic forces and build a democratic state geared to the interests of working people. Hence the aggressiveness to be found in the national democrats' actions, hence their reliance on

detachments of militants [otryady boyevikov], unrestrained nationalist propaganda, and shameless intimidation of people with the totalitarian regime that the communists will, allegedly without fail, establish on coming to power.

The national democrats' lie can't save them now, and the documents adopted by the congress completely demolish it.

[Marmazov] Work in the soviets, above all the supreme soviet, is for the CPU, it can be said, virgin soil. Previously no such problem even existed. It will be necessary to start by forming a faction and elaborating its immediate and future tasks. A mechanism to prevent Ukraine's sliding into the abyss is one of the most important tasks. Ukrainian Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma and those who support him are right—it has long been time for us to determine what society and state we are building. Adopting the new constitution is an equally important task. It is no secret that the draft is largely being tailored to suit the incumbent president. Moreover, what we have here are pretty high-powered attempts to drive society into accepting a Fundamental Law geared to authoritarian power.

Union of Crimean Communists Sets Up Party

*PM2806123593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Jun 93 p 1*

[Vasiliy Torskiy report: "The Crimea Gets Its Own Communist Party"]

[Text] At the conference of the Union of Crimean Communists held in Simferopol the republic Communist Party was formed. Party committees are operating in all cities and regions of the peninsula right now. Around 300 primary party organizations have been set up; almost 10,000 CPSU members—some of whom begin their party service only this year—are performing public work within them. The conference confirmed the party's rules and defined its program principles.

Belarus**Shushkevich To Meet With Clinton 23 Jul***WS3006104193 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0700 GMT 30 Jun 93*

[Text] As reported earlier, Stanislav Shushkevich, head of the Belarusian Supreme Soviet, is scheduled to meet with U.S. President Bill Clinton in Washington on 23 July. According to reliable sources, the Belarusian delegation will consist of 30 persons. During the visit, the two leaders are expected to sign a joint declaration and announce it on the White House lawn. Among the delegation's participants, there will be representatives of several Supreme Soviet commissions and businessmen. According to Petr Kravchanka, the purpose of the visit does not require the participation of the foreign minister. He explained that the participation of the foreign minister in the previous visits by legislative and government leaders was caused by the need to establish personal contacts in the process of consolidating a sovereign Belarusian state.

Polish Leader Addresses Supreme Soviet*WS2906150893 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 1200 GMT 29 Jun 93*

[Report by correspondent Mikhail Rudkovskiy from the Supreme Soviet session; Walesa speaks in Polish with superimposed translation into Belarusian; translated from the Polish]

[Text] [Rudkovskiy] The main event at the Supreme Soviet session today was the speech of Polish President Lech Walesa, who is on an official visit to Belarus. Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich cleared the floor for the Polish president. Due to the short time of my coverage, I am turning on the recording of Mr. Walesa's speech.

[Begin Walesa recording] Esteemed chairman of the Supreme Soviet! Esteemed deputies! Ladies and gentlemen! It is with genuine pleasure and satisfaction that I am visiting in the independent Republic of Belarus. I would like to thank the Supreme Soviet chairman for the opportunity to make a speech in the legislature of the independent Belarusian state. It has been almost three years since Belarus declared its independence on 27 July, which is your national holiday. This date is also important for the Poles, because it symbolizes the beginning of a real neighborly dialogue and cooperation between our Slavic peoples. Poland and Belarus recovered their freedom and sovereignty, and can freely settle their problems and choose their way of life. Neighbors need no middlemen to reach a mutual understanding. From this time, it is our wisdom and hearts that became our leaders, and not an alien dictate. From now on, time will be working for us if we make use of the historic chance and meet the challenge. I deeply believe that we will be able to achieve this like friends and wise people. Poland is watching the consolidation of the Belarusian state

organism with sympathy and great interest. We understand how many problems are occurring in this sphere. The biggest [words indistinct] patriotic and national aspirations, restoration of your national awareness, and cherishing your language and culture. [end recording]

[Rudkovskiy] Polish experience shows, noted Lech Walesa, that democracy is worth [words indistinct] democratic system, and we are ready to share our experience in this. Belarusians and Poles should look up to the experience of the European democracies in order to avoid the danger of military confrontation and arms race. Lech Walesa concluded:

[Begin Walesa recording] The most important thing for us is the future, and when we work real hard, we will be able to maintain the sovereignty and build a good future for our peoples, for which the future generations will be grateful to us. [end recording]

Holds News Conference*LD2906142693 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 1400 GMT 29 Jun 93*

[Excerpts] A 20-minute speech by President Lech Walesa was received with warm applause by a majority of Belarusian deputies. [passage omitted]

I would like to add that during the news conference, President Lech Walesa criticized the U.S. rocket attack on Baghdad. He suggested that Washington had taken over the role of a world policeman.

Says Poland Has 'No Territorial Claims' on Belarus*LD2906193993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1917 GMT 29 Jun 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk June 29 (TASS)—"Poland has no territorial claims on Belarus. And the transfer of part of Polish troops from its Western border closer to the eastern one is by no means aimed against either Belarus or any other state", Polish President Lech Walesa, who is currently on an official visit to Belarus, told a news conference on Tuesday [29 June]. He noted that both Poland and Belarus were now going through a radical change. Former politics, philosophy, military doctrine are already out of date and this reality cannot be disregarded, whether one likes it or not.

In his turn, Belarusian President Stanislav Shushkevich emphasised three points. First, he said he was utterly satisfied with the outcome of the talks. Second, it became evident that for developing truly friendly relations it is necessary to maintain regular contacts at all levels, including the highest ones. And third, ways of communication between citizens of the two sovereign countries are becoming more simple and available.

Touching upon the fate of ethnic Poles residing in Belarus, the Polish president said, "today I am going to speak to Poles living in Belarus. And I will tell them without fail: love the land whose bread you are eating and don't do anything which might disunite us".

Later in the day, Walesa and members of the Polish delegation left Minsk for the West Belarusian town of Baranovich.

Moldova

Russia To Grant 'Few Billion Rubles' to Dniester

AU2906175493 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 2010
GMT 28 Jun 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 28/6/1993—Reliable sources from the presidential team of the self-proclaimed Dniester republic communicated to a BASAPRESS correspondent that the state structures of the Russian Federation have adopted a decision according to which Dniester will obtain hard cash in the amount of a few billion rubles. The mentioned source pointed out that this sum will be discharged by industrial and agricultural plants which will deliver their produce to Russia in exchange for this sum. In the opinion of local observers, the long-term visit undertaken by Tiraspol's delegation headed by Vladimir Zagreabschi and Oleg Natahin, the minister of economy and finance, prepared a well organised basis for such an exchange.

Romanian Embassy Opens in Chisinau

AU2906175293 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 2010
GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 28/6/1993—"Actually, we are sure that the ceremony of inauguration of the Romanian Embassy office in Chisinau was organised in full accordance with the spirit of Christianity, traditions and Romanism and luck coincided with the date of a common meeting of ministerial committees from Bucharest and Chisinau," declared Marian Enache, the Ambassador of Romania in the Republic of Moldova. The Romanian Embassy, the doors of which will be opened for all Romanian people and for all citizens of the Republic of Moldova and Romania, will do its best to contribute in the most efficient way possible towards the tightest links between the two Romanian states, added Marian Enache. "In this celebrated moment when we are present at the ceremony of inauguration of the headquarters of the Romanian Embassy in Chisinau, the first embassy in the newly independent Republic of Moldova we should express thanks to those people who during the period of declaration of Moldovan independence, had undertaken some risk to approve the important decision to introduce the Romanian language, the national hymn and all other characteristics of the Republic of Moldova," declared Teodor Melescanu, the Minister of the state and the Minister of Foreign Affairs who were present at the ceremony. The religious ceremony of inauguration was handled by Archbishop Teofil, the counselor of the Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church Teoctist.

Tajikistan

Opposition Casualties Result From Border Clashes

LD3006115093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1026 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By KHOVAR news agency for TASS]

[Text] Dushanbe June 30 TASS—Up to 20 Tajik opposition militants were killed and wounded over the past five days while trying to penetrate into Tajikistan from neighbouring Afghanistan, according to the command of Russian frontier troops in the Central Asian Republic.

It also said that a 50-men strong group had penetrated into the Tajik territory several days ago, but was surrounded in the village of Vari in Khatlon region.

Strongholds of Russian frontier troops were fired at from across the border and the command warned of retaliation in case the provocations continue. It added that attempts to bring weapons and ammunition to Tajikistan were staged from the Afghan territory controlled by Afghan Field Commander Bashir, the son of Vakil Abdullo.

However, the command stressed that together with Tajik Government Forces it fully controls the situation in the hot spot.

Parliament Appeals to Afghanistan on Border Issue

LD2906201293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1859 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By KHOVAR NEWS AGENCY correspondent Negmat Ochilov]

[Text] Dushanbe, June 29 (TASS)—Tajik republican newspapers published today an appeal of the Tajik parliament to the leadership and the noble people of the Islamic state of Afghanistan.

The document says, in particular, "the Tajik and Afghan peoples have had common culture and language, many-centuries-old deep roots and stable fraternal relations". The appeal notes with regret the current unstable situation on the Tajik-Afghan border often becomes a reason for armed clashes, human victims and material losses, which does not correspond to sincere fraternal relations between our states.

Despite repeated requests and demands of Tajikistan, acts of sabotage and attacks on the Tajik borders on the part of opposition forces, which have spilled blood of thousands of innocent people and turned Tajik cities and settlements in ruins, says the document.

The Tajik leadership and people are sure Afghan brothers will help the return of all Tajik refugees to their motherland.

Dushanbe Cracks Down on Opposition Parties

MK2906123093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 29, 29 Jun 93 (signed to press 28 Jun) p 4

[Mikhail Missiri report under "Tajikistan" column: "Imamali Rakhmanov 'Builds Democracy.' All Parties Except Communists Banned in the Country"]

[Text] On 26 June in Dushanbe, a few days after all opposition movements in Tajikistan were banned, Supreme Soviet Chairman Imamali Rakhmanov addressed a parliament session, the first after the victory in the civil war, with a policy speech rejecting accusations that his regime violates human rights. On the same day parliament gave its consent to criminal proceedings being opened against two leaders of spiritual and secular opposition: Kazikalon Khodzha Akbar Turadzhonzoda and Takhir Dzhabbarov, head of the people's movement Rastokhez.

"We are being charged with creating a totalitarian communist state, but our republic is not communist. We are trying to build a democratic, secular state where law will reign supreme," the Tajik parliament chairman stated, standing on a rostrum with a Lenin statue towering behind it.

Early last week the judicial collegium of the Tajikistan Supreme Court banned four opposition movements: the Democratic Islamic Party of Tajikistan, the Lali Badakhshon society, the Rastokhez movement, and the Islamic Revival party. These organizations are charged with violating Article 21 of the law on public organizations, which forbids parties and movements to take actions aimed at overthrowing the constitutional system, creating armed units, and fomenting racial, ethnic, and religious animosity.

At present the communists are the only legalized political party in Tajikistan. They have approximately one-quarter of seats in parliament.

International human rights organizations accuse the Dushanbe regime of mass violations of human rights, and also of being involved in assassinations of their political rivals.

Supreme Soviet Appoints New Justice Minister

LD2906171993 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0300 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Having examined a representation from the chairman of the Tajikistan Council of Ministers and in accordance with Article 108 of the Constitution, Basic Law of the Republic of Tajikistan, the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Shavkat Mahmudovich Ismoilov as Tajikistan minister of justice. This decree has been submitted for approval by the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet.

Azerbaijan

National Assembly Confirms Guseynov Prime Minister

LD3006095593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0943 GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Baku June 30 TASS—Surat Guseynov, 34, colonel of the Azerbaijani national army, has just been confirmed as a new prime minister of the republic at a session of the National Assembly of Azerbaijan.

Guseynov's candidacy was suggested by Geydar Aliyev, acting president and Azerbaijani parliament speaker.

On Tuesday [29 June] the two leaders completed political consultations, during which, according to confidential sources, they managed, in all probability, to find a way out of the crisis situation in which the republic had found itself.

[Baku ASSA-IRADA in English at 0952 GMT on 30 June adds: "Colonel Surat Guseynov has been appointed prime minister of Azerbaijan. The decree about it of eliminating the authority of president chairman of Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan Geydar Aliyev was ratified today by Milli Mejlis of Republic. Surat Guseynov, national hero of Azerbaijan, deputy of Supreme Soviet, former plenipotentiary representative of president in Karabakh, president of republican company Azersherst, commander of military unit 709 of Azerbaijan National Army, was born in town Yevlach in 1959, graduated from Ganja Technological Institute passed road from a worker till the manager of Yevlach initial wool processing factory. In March of this year was dismissed by the decree of president from plenipotentiary of representative of president in Karabakh and since then hadn't subordinated to decree, had been with his supporters in Ganja. On June 4 in Ganja during the attempt by the government troops to disarm the military unit there were bloody events after which there began an opposition turing into deep state crisis in Azerbaijan. After the negotiations in Baku of Geydar Aliyev and Surat Guseynov on the ways-out of crisis there was solved to unite the efforts of all political parties and movements. At the regular session of Milli Mejlis Geydar Aliyev positively characterized the work of Surat Guseynov and also in the sphere of economy and proposed to nominate him prime-minister of Azerbaijan. 36 deputies voted for this proposal 1 voted against, no deputies abstained from voting. 38 deputies voted."]

Aliyev Says Appointment Averts 'Civil War'

LD3006114893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1056 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Baku June 30 TASS—Parliament Chairman Gaydar Aliyev praised rebel leader Surat Guseynov as a

popular person in the republic and said his appointment as the prime minister averted the threat of a civil war pending over Azerbaijan.

Aliyev who proposed Guseynov to the post after three-day consultations recalled that he was awarded the title of the National Hero of Azerbaijan by President Abulfaz Elchibey, was the presidential envoy in Nagorno-Karabakh and deputy prime minister.

He especially emphasised Guseynov's merits in organising the National Army and defending Azerbaijan from Armenian aggression.

Aliyev recalled that the new prime minister is experienced in industrial activities as he had once headed a wool-processing enterprise.

The new prime minister assured legislators that he has enough capabilities and power to end the conflict in Karabakh and take Azerbaijan out of a deep economic crisis.

The parliament in its turn decided to cancel its previous decision and subordinate the Defence, Interior and Security Ministries to the government thus vesting considerable powers with Guseynov. Earlier the three ministries were subordinated directly to the president.

The lawmakers also dismissed Prosecutor-General Ikhtiyar Shirinov.

Aliyev, Guseynov Hold Joint News Conference

NC3006125093 Baku TURAN in English 1157 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Baku June 30 (TURAN)—Today right after Milli Mejlis sitting joint press-conference of Geydar Aliyev and just now elected prime-minister Surat Guseynov took place.

Answering the question on the programme of actions on premiers office, Surat Guseynov said: "I see three main problems: to put an end to the war, to raise economic level, to supply population with products". On the question about the end of war with Armenia, Surat Guseynov answered: "We want to solve this matter by means of talks, but if Armenia will not agree, everything would be solved by military force".

Commenting rumours about possible review of agreements with Western companies on development of oil fields on Caspian Sea, Geydar Aliyev said: "I understand our partners anxiety, but I think their concern about it is unfounded, we just want to examine something. I think something was wrong in those agreements".

Answering the question on changing relations between Russia and Azerbaijan, Geydar Aliyev said, "Azerbaijan stands for steady and honest relations with all its neighbours".

Touching upon possible development of events in the Republic, Geydar Aliyev said, "The main fact is that we

could avert civil war. Our main problem at present is to lead Azerbaijan out of today political, military and economic crisis".

Surat Guseynov in his turn declared, that in 15 days he would present his programme of coming out of economic crisis.

Speaking about possible alliance of different political parties of Azerbaijan, Geydar Aliyev stressed, he would leave the door open and would invite everybody "for cooperation for Azerbaijanians welfare".

Further on News Conference

LD3006134593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1317
GMT 30 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Sevindzh Abdullayeva and Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku June 30 TASS—New Azeri Prime Minister Surat Guseynov promised to the people to end war with Armenia, end the economic crisis and provide enough food to the population.

Addressing a joint news conference with Parliament Chairman Geydar Aliyev on Wednesday [30 June], he said he would "use all efforts to end the war imposed on Azerbaijan in the near future". However, "if the diplomatic efforts fail everything will be done by the military way and the war will end only in the victory of Azerbaijan", according to Guseynov.

He also said that the post of the president in the republic should be abolished until new parliamentary elections.

Aliyev, in his turn, added that it is premature to announce new elections. It is first necessary to ensure stability in the republic and put an end to military failures in the war with Armenia.

Aliyev believes that President Abulfaz Elchibey who had fled Baku should "take care about his future himself".

He promised that "democracy in Azerbaijan will continue" and said the new leadership adheres to democratic principles, political pluralism, the freedom of speech and human rights.

He is against comparing his return to office with a communist comeback in Azerbaijan saying "those people have come to power who the population trusts".

Aliyev said Azerbaijan will develop mutually beneficial relations with Russia and other former soviet republics, but refused to state whether his country will become a fully-fledged member of the commonwealth. He said he is "poorly informed about this creation" and has to learn more about it before expressing his opinion.

The parliament chairman said the fact that western oil companies had suspended the signing of a contract with Azerbaijan should not cause much concern. "The

approach of the current leadership to the issues will be more reasonable and civilised", he added.

Aliyev stressed that he remains the head of state although the defence, interior and security ministries are now subordinated to the prime minister. According to the constitution, "the cabinet of ministers is subordinated to the president and as far as I am acting head of state that means it is subordinated to me", he said.

Aliyev Proposes, Parliament Passes Cabinet Changes

NC3006110393 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 0924
GMT 30 Jun 93

["Power-Ministries Are Included in Staff of Ministers' Cabinet of Azerbaijan"—ASSA-IRADA headline]

[Text] Baku 30.06.93 (ASSA-IRADA)—As is generally known, by the resolution of Milli Mejlis from April 28 of this year they were led out of government staff. Now in connection with the necessity to ensure the security of government and according to the 123 Article of Constitution of Azerbaijan I propose to include the Ministries of Defence, Internal Affairs and National Security into a structure of Azerbaijan ministers' cabinet, said Geydar Aliyev. For this proposal voted 34 deputies, against-29 abstained-192 deputies didn't vote.

[Baku TURAN in English at 0924 GMT on 30 June adds: "Milli Mejlis by 33 votes passed the resolution on changing structure of the cabinet.

["The staff of the cabinet includes three ministries: defense minister, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Security Ministry."]

Aliyev Replaces Leading Officials

NC2906195293 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri
1700 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Geydar Aliyev, acting president and chairman of the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet, has decreed that in line with the 5 May presidential decree reorganizing the presidential apparatus, Rafiq Ismail ogly Ismailov has been relieved as state adviser on humanitarian issues.

Aliyev has decreed that the presidential decree, dated [words indistinct], appointing Tofik Dzhavad ogly Guseynov as the president's competent representative, be regarded as null and void.

Aliyev has decreed that A. Nazim ogly Mullazade has been relieved as the president's special representative on matters relating to the talks on the dispute between Azerbaijan and Armenia. Mullazade has also been relieved as the director of the Foreign Relations Department, which is on the level of a state adviser's office.

Aliyev has decreed that Dzhemil Polatkan ogly Gasanov be relieved as presidential adviser on general affairs; Gulam Gusayn Sulkhay ogly Aliyev as presidential

adviser on parliamentary affairs; Arif Aslan ogy Aliyev as presidential press secretary; and Fazil Gazanfer ogy Mustafayev as director of the State Legal Affairs Department within the framework of the presidential apparatus.

National Assembly Discusses Elchibey's Fate

NC3006085993 Baku TURAN in English 0720 GMT
30 Jun 93

["Milli Mejlis Decides President Elchibey's Fate"—TURAN headline]

[Text] Baku, June 30 (TURAN)—Today at 11 oclock in Baku Milli Mejlis again started discussing the matters, [words indistinct] political crisis, which took shape after Ganja military uprising June 4.

Deputy commission, investigating "Ganja events", must represent preliminary conclusion on happened events.

In case if violation of the Constitution by President Elchibey, who remains figurehead of the government, will be proved, parliament will recourse to impeachment.

At the same time, sources close to Supreme Soviet informed, that negotiations between speaker Geydar Aliyev and Colonel Surat Guseynov still continued yesterday. Colonel seek after the office with wide authorities in the government of the country. [sentence as received]

Today at 13.00 Geydar Aliyev is to held press-conference in the parliament.

People's Front To Cease Activities Until Elchibey Returns

NC2906123093 Baku TURAN in English 0947 GMT
29 Jun 93

[Text] Baku June 29 (TURAN)—At the conference of PFA [Azerbaijani People's Front] that took place at the central headquarters the representatives of this organization at the supreme organs of government, have discussed the situation in the country decided to stop their activities until President Elchibey return to Baku and restoration of his authorities.

Vice-Premier Ali Masimov, Minister of Internal Economic Relations Rauf Karayev, Chairman of State Custom Committee Ibragim Veliyev, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Tourism Aliasker Siyabli, Chairman of the Principal Tax Inspection Isa Bagirov, Deputy- Minister of Foreign Affairs Mirdzhalal Yusifli, President of Azerbaijan State Oil Company Sabit Bagirov and his deputy Nadzhaf Nadzhafov signed declaration of temporary stopping of their activities as a token of protest against military coup, committed by the rebels and affirmed by Milli Mejlis June 29 1993.

PFA Headquarters Communications Cut Off

NC2906154093 Baku TURAN in English 1113 GMT
29 Jun 93

[Text] Baku, 29 Jun (TURAN)—As PFA [Azerbaijani People's Front] information center reported, government communication in this organization was cut off from today.

TURAN agency was credibly informed, that government communication in PFA headquarter was cut off by the Cabinet leadership order.

Elchibey Supporters Hold Rally in Baku 29 Jun

LD2906181793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1742 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent and AZERTAC]

[Text] Baku, 29 Jun—Despite the fact that a state of emergency is still in force in Azerbaijan, supporters of the National Front are holding a rally in Baku tonight in support of Abulfaz Elchibey, president of the republic. According to the 5,000 people who are now gathering in the center of Baku, not far from the headquarters of the National Front of Azerbaijan, "the decision of the National assembly to transfer the powers of the head of state to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet has no legal basis." Moreover, the participants of the rally are saying that "a coup d'etat has been carried out in Azerbaijan, and that the National Assembly legalized it through its decision."

It was also declared that the National Front reserves the right to fight through all acceptable democratic means for Abulfaz Elchibey's return to power as the legally elected president of Azerbaijan.

Guseynov Comments on Recent Events, Prospects

LD3006090293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0825 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jun (ITAR-TASS)—"There is only one way out: to unite all political forces and to think together on how to end the war as soon as possible and to raise people's living standards"—this is the prospect "rebel" Colonel Surat Guseynov sees for Azerbaijan. "There is a war on in the republic," he noted in an interview with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA published today. "New elections will entail colossal material and moral costs. The people will inevitably split into two camps in the course of the elections. Now is not the time to share posts."

"It is perfectly natural for the present regime to have collapsed," Surat Guseynov asserts with conviction. "Under the banner of democracy, the leaders of the National Front of Azerbaijan attempted to establish a veritable military cum police dictatorship."

"Yes, I was of the view that Elchibey and his team, who brought unprecedented suffering to the people in the

year they have been in power, have lost the moral right to lead the republic. However, this does not at all mean that I was preparing a military coup," he emphasized.

"I felt that Elchibey's team would not let me finish the war," he said, touching on the situation in Karabakh. "Both Ter-Petrosyan's and Elchibey's regimes act according to one scenario and are being controlled from the same center. Moreover, certain forces in both republics have a very strong desire for the war not to come to an end. After all, the 'top echelons' earn millions from the war," reckons Guseynov. "I will act in accordance with the will of the people. If the people wish to do so, they will themselves put me forward," he replied to a question about his role in the new power structure.

Guseynov's Troops Moving Toward Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2906122893 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] In Azerbaijan, Colonel Surat Guseynov's troops are moving in the direction of Nagorno-Karabakh after pulling away from the capital, Baku. Azerbaijan's Defense Ministry says Armenian forces have captured the city of Agdere and approached the city of Agdam. Col. Guseynov has announced it is time to unite forces to liberate the occupied Azeri lands.

At yesterday's meeting in Baku between Guseynov and the Acting President Geydar Aliyev it was pointed out that stabilizing the situation and settling burning problems could be possible only if national reconciliation was achieved.

Geydar Aliyev has started to replace the staff of the deposed President Abulfaz Elchibey. For one, the state and foreign secretaries have been dismissed. Meanwhile, Mr. Elchibey told the Turkish TV he would run for presidency if presidential elections were called.

Former Security Chief Freed for Health Reasons

NC3006100193 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 0920 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] Baku 30.06.93 [ASSA-IRADA]—Former Chief of Committee of State Security of Azerbaijan Vagif Guseynov is set free on account of his state of health. He has given a written undertaking not to leave till the end of investigation.

Official Denies Foreign Oil Activity Suspended

NC2906173993 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 1524 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Baku, 29.06.93 (ASSA-IRADA)—Rumours that foreign oil companies suspended their activities are not true to the fact said first Vice-Premier, Acting Prime-Minister Vakhid Akhmedov in the exclusive interview to ASSA-IRADA. It is known that June 7, President of State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Sabit Bagirov

(resigned by the moment) signed the declaration on the joint development of the Azeri, Guneshly, Chirag oil fields by seven foreign oil companies.

This issue was not handled by the Government of Azerbaijan. In connection with the complicated political situation in the republic the declaration was suspended. There are a number of viewpoints concerning this declaration in the Azeri Government. For this reason we decided to study it thoroughly as the government has no documents revealing its essence. The Socar National Petroleum Corporation of Azerbaijan was within the president's jurisdiction only and its chapter was adopted by the president. The cabinet has never had its documents. The president of the company was vested right to sign contracts, treaties and declaration. Our aim is to step up the conclusion of contracts. The 2-year work with foreign companies has resulted in no contracts signed and the declaration impedes this process. Such a delay is harmful for Azerbaijan. So, we invited the leaders of the 7 companies to visit Azerbaijan starting July 1. The talks will seek stepping up signing of the contacts profitable for Azerbaijan. When asked whether this declaration will get invalid, the vice-premier said this issue is to be debated over by the government.

Do you think these oil companies can satisfy their interest under the present circumstances? Asked ASSA-IRADA correspondent.

No, said the acting premier. Azerbaijan invariably intends to boost cooperation with foreign companies.

Why can the declaration delay the signing of the contract?

Because it will take time, said V. Akhmedov. According to the available information, some companies, e.g. Amoco, BP, Penzoi are ready to sign some contracts.

The joint declaration was not initiated by the companies themselves, was it? Asked the correspondent.

It was initiated by our oil company and the foreign counterparts supported this step.

Aliyev Assures Turkey on Oil Agreements

NC2906200193 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Azerbaijan's ambassador in Ankara has informed ANATOLIA NEWS AGENCY that Geydar Aliyev, acting president and chairman of the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet, attaches importance to the republic's relations with Turkey. The ambassador conferred with Aliyev by telephone yesterday, when Aliyev instructed him to tell the Turkish people that the cancellation of the agreements Turkey has signed in connection with Azerbaijan's oil has not been considered.

Several recent reports in the Turkish newspapers claim the Azerbaijani National Assembly has canceled the agreements relating to oil prospecting in Azerbaijan,

including the extraction and sale of the republic's oil reserves. They also claim the National Assembly has canceled the draft project laying an oil pipeline between Baku and Yumurtalik in Turkey. Several foreign firms, including the Turkish Petroleum Corporation, are parties to the draft agreement. Ankara has vested significant hopes in it because of the benefits it will bring Turkey. It will help Azerbaijan, politically and economically, to become a truly independent republic.

Signing Oil Contract With Western Firms Postponed

LD2906174693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] The signing of a contract totalling about \$12 billion between the state oil company of Azerbaijan and eight leading Western oil corporations for developing three promising fields on the Caspian shelf has been postponed for an indefinite period. This decision has been taken by the government of Azerbaijan as a result of the political crisis and the forthcoming reshuffle in the Cabinet of Ministers. A visit to London by the leaders of the Azerbaijani oil company has been postponed. The signing of the contract had been planned for the end of June.

Aliyev Issues Decree To Raise Minimum Wage

LD2906202593 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Geydar Aliyev, chairman of the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet, has issued a decree on raising minimum wages. According to RIA, wages will go up on 1 July from 300 to 500 manat, equivalent roughly to 5,000 rubles. It is thought that Aliyev's decree will evoke more response among the population than the reshuffle in the presidential team.

Georgia

Chikvaidze Demands Earliest Russian Troop Withdrawal

LD2906161293 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Today, 29 June, Georgian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze summoned Russian Ambassador to Georgia Vladimir Zemskiy, and handed him a note for the Russian Foreign Ministry. The note says that during his visit to Georgia, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev was given the Georgian parliament's resolution about the timely withdrawal of Russian troops from Georgian territory. That resolution is part of a package of bilateral agreements. However, the development of events in Abkhazia shows that it has become impossible to sign this package as a whole, the note says.

Due to the above and in connection with the resolution of the Georgian parliament, the Georgian Foreign Ministry insists on the necessity of the earliest possible withdrawal of the Russian armed forces from the entire territory of Georgia.

Abkhaz Minister Urges Treaty With Russia To Defeat Ardzinba

LD2906140493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1249 GMT 29 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi June 29 TASS—Abkhazian Prime Minister Tamaz Nadareishvili told the parliament of this Caucasian republic today that Georgia should not drag feet in signing a treaty and other agreements with Russia.

Nadareishvili made clear the need to agree to some concessions and compromise solutions in order to regulate inter-state relations between Georgia and its northern neighbor, cooperation with which is in the mutual interests of both countries.

According to the prime minister, the signing of a treaty with Russia would defeat the separatist policy of the Gudauta administration headed by Vladislav Ardzinba, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia.

Comments on Sukhumi Bombing

LD3006124593 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0400 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Statement by Tamaz Nadareishvili, chairman of the Abkhaz Council of Ministers; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] We present an interview with Tamaz Nadareishvili, chairman of the Abkhaz Council of Ministers. This interview touches on the statement by the Russian Government following the barbaric bombing of Sukhumi, saying that the Russian Government is alarmed by the bombing of Sukhumi and if it continues the Russian leadership will take definite measures. Mr. Nadareishvili is commenting on this particular issue.

[Begin Nadareishvili recording] After Sukhumi had been bombed, there were claims that we ourselves had bombed Akhali Atoni and Abkhazians retaliated by opening fire on Sukhumi. This is not true. Before the bombing took place, a Russian Embassy representative in Sukhumi was there. He witnessed that we had not fired, as artillery noise can be heard at a distance. He witnessed himself that the town had been bombed. So I asked him to make a statement as well. We made a statement too. On the next day, the Russian Government statement was broadcast. When Russians are talking about the measures they will take, I think they have military measures in mind. If we start bombing, then they will take measures to eliminate our firing points using force; the same goes for the Abkhaz side.

This is a fair attitude, but if we take into consideration the fact that the Russians still side with the Abkhazians and nothing is done there without Russian interference, I think this can be used against us. Of course, the Russians will not bomb Abkhazia, but it will be their cause to bomb our town and positions. As you remember, earlier the Russians used to bomb towns themselves using planes and artillery. It was done openly so we could see it with our own eyes. Today they are not bombing either with planes or artillery, and the instructors who make corrections [not further identified] are Russian and the Russians cannot bomb their own locations. So this is once again against us. [end recording]

Parliament Discusses International Ties, Abkhazia

LD2906202493 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1800 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Excerpts] Two issues of major importance were discussed at a parliament session today: international relations of Georgia and a current situation in Abkhazia.

The Georgian head of state made a report about the results of his visits to Belgium, Germany, and Ukraine. [passage omitted]

Information about the current situation in Abkhazia was presented by Abkhazian Council of Ministers Chairman Tamaz Nadareishvili. He requested that additional rights be given to the head of state in the current war situation, that relations with Russia be settled, that Russian troops be given special status so that Russia will pay currency, and that the appropriate document be signed in the normal way between two equal states do.

Information about the extremely hard situation in Abkhazia was given by Geno Kalandia, a member of parliament.

Members of parliament expressed unequivocal views about providing the head of state with additional rights and signing a treaty with Russia. Abkhazian problems become an issue of Russo-Georgian relations.

Georgian Defense Minister Giorgiy Karkarashvili and Tamaz Nadareishvili spoke at the end of the session.

Lithuania

U.S. Actions Against Iraq Viewed as 'Self-Defense'

LD3006084393 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 30 Jun 93

[Text] The Lithuanian Foreign Ministry is aware of the threat of international terrorism and condemns states supporting terrorism. We understand the reasons that prompted the U.S. actions aimed at the Iraqi intelligence service which had endeavored to organize an attempt on the life of the former President, George Bush, during his visit in Kuwait. These actions are regarded as an act of self-defense.

At the same time we express our regret at the death of innocent civilian people. We believe that the use of the appropriate international mechanisms in solving such problems is the best way to strive for a just final solution, reads the statement by the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry.

Russia Halts Natural Gas Supplies

LD2806155993 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 28 Jun 93

[Text] I would like to inform once again those who did not hear the news an hour ago concerning the gas supply. This time I would like to present you another version of the report which was received from the Baltic News Service agency.

A telegram was received yesterday by the Lietuvos Dujos [Lithuanian Gas] enterprise from the Russian gas company Gazprom stating that the natural gas supply to Lithuania would be stopped from 0800 this morning. The telegram says that the company was compelled to take such a step because of the huge debt owed by Lithuania and the critical financial situation of the Russian extraction enterprises.

By the way, although the gas supply to Lithuania has been stopped, the supply to the Kaliningrad Oblast, the Jonava Azotas, and the Panevezys Ekranas enterprises will continue, because they purchase natural gas from the (SAF) company.

Gas supplies in hand, if the Lithuanian consumers use it sparingly, should be enough for two to three weeks. The gas supply has been stopped to power engineering enterprises. Other consumers have also been warned to reduce the consumption of gas.

General Says Klaipeda Troop Withdrawal Going 'Smoothly'

LD2906195393 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 29 Jun 93

[Text] Today Mayor of Klaipeda Benediktas Petrauskas received the commander of the operational group for the withdrawal of the Russian Army from Lithuania, Major

General Profatilov. Profatilov informed that Russian Armed Forces are being withdrawn from Klaipeda smoothly. The tank regiment is on the move, armament of the marine division is being removed. The general confirmed that all Russian military units will leave Klaipeda by 25 to 27 August.

Valeriy Profatilov was interested in social guarantees to the families of reserve officers and servicemen remaining in Lithuania and discussed other urgent issues.

RESPUBLIKA on Foreign Policy 'Mistakes'

WS2906130393 Vilnius RESPUBLIKA in Lithuanian 15 Jun 93 No. 113 p 4

[Editorial under the "Editorial Column" rubric: "Was It the President's Last Mistake?"]

[Text] Last Friday [11 June], the president admitted to the LDDP [Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party] faction and later to the nation that he had made an organizational mistake in foreign policy. S. Lozoraitis, Lithuanian ambassador in Washington, was recalled without providing a proper successor. This week S. Lozoraitis will bid farewell to the Embassy in Washington, and Lithuania will be left without its representative in this great superpower. If ELTA's information is reliable, V. Cekanauskas, a candidate proposed by the Foreign Ministry, refused the position of charge d'affaires.

We should welcome the fact that the president can admit his mistakes. However, the key question remains unanswered: Was this mistake accidental?

The president tried to justify the misunderstanding with the ambassador in the United States by saying that "Lithuanian foreign policy is only making its first steps." Does this mean that His Excellency has erased the first three years from the history of Lithuanian diplomacy before the LDDP's return to power? It is no secret today that it is S. Lozoraitis who managed to persuade doubtful V. Landsbergis before 11 March 1990 to immediately restore Lithuania's independence. S. Lozoraitis' subsequent vigorous diplomatic activities, and the lobbying of the U.S. Lithuanian community in Congress, ensured this country's support for our liberation movement.

Some people say that we lack specialists in foreign policy. Why then did the LDDP reject the services of the most experienced Lithuanian diplomats? When one sees how J. Paleckis defends the president's honor with professional skill, how E. Bickauskas and S. Lozoraitis idle without diplomatic work, then one begins to wonder whether these are not the attempts to replace this problem.

The episode with S. Lozoraitis in this "economic" foreign policy is only the tip of the iceberg. Its real shape is beginning to show "under the water"—it is enough to study who represents Lithuania in other countries. Last week, R. Ramoska, former industry and trade deputy minister, was appointed ambassador to Ukraine. He was

responsible for the free trade agreement with Russia. The agreement has not yet been concluded, because we do not want to recognize Russia's demand that Lithuania assume responsibility for the "shadow" reexports of Russian resources that are flourishing in our country. It is said openly but unofficially in diplomatic circles that it is R. Ramoska who delayed the signing of this agreement. Now R. Ramoska is leaving for Kiev, which has established a new, "independent from Moscow" center of material supplies for the republics after the collapse of the notorious "Gossnab" (USSR state supply system). Another supplier—R. Kozyrovicius—is already working at the Lithuanian Embassy in Moscow. The LDDP specialists in foreign policy have inherited two more economic diplomats—L. Kucinskas, Lithuanian consul in the United States, and J. Rudalevicius, economic counsel at the Lithuanian Embassy in Germany. They are both responsible for concluding the contract on the printing of Lithuanian passports, according to which the government paid \$6 million for the production of low-quality documents.

Another colorful figure in Lithuanian diplomacy is V. Papirtis who was sentenced for bribery and served a two-year term in prison, and who was rehabilitated under Landsbergis' rule.... He is the current deputy of Foreign Minister P. Gylys who says that the presumption of innocence should be applied to V. Papirtis. At a recent press conference, the deputy minister dwelled on Lithuania's ambition to rule and to neutralize the influence of other states, and on the need to have good relations with

the neighbors. This goal deserves praise. However, V. Papirtis himself supervises the demarcation of the state border with Belarus, and he is unable to cope with this task. The talks are difficult, and there is no wire for marking the border.... This might be the reason why our prime minister rushed to the assistance of our Foreign Ministry. He managed to find a spontaneous solution to some stalemate "problems" during his unofficial meeting with the Belarusian prime minister at the Lake Naroch. The fate of the agreement with Poland is similar, although ministerial clerks maintain that things are normal here. However, the only abnormal thing is the absence of the agreement with Poland.

Who is accountable for these first, as the president put it, Lithuanian moves in foreign policy, which are actually the LDDP's moves? According to the Constitution, we should demand this responsibility from the president himself. The president admitted his mistake. However, he did this only after the mass media had reported about his meeting with the LDDP faction where the mentioned confession had escaped his lips. The president's words were probably not meant for the public. J. Paleckis' swift reaction made these words significant when he did not deny the responsibility of the foreign minister and K. Bobelis, chairman of the Seimas Foreign Affairs Committee, for the scandal concerning S. Lozoraitis' recall. It looks like no one is going to draw relevant conclusions from this story. The LDDP and the president are unlikely to reconsider their foreign policy in principle.